

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD

A Contribution to the Study of Comparative Religion

A COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES

Delivered at South Place Institute

NOW REVISED AND IN SOME CASES REWRITTEN BY THE AUTHORS,
TOGETHER WITH SOME OTHERS SPECIALLY WRITTEN FOR THIS VOLUME



LONDON
SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO., LIMITED
25 HIGH STREET, BLOOMSBURY
1908

FIRST EDITION, *December*, 1889; SECOND EDITION
December, 1891; THIRD EDITION, *February*, 1893;
FOURTH EDITION, *January*, 1901; FIFTH EDITION
August, 1901; SIXTH EDITION, *October*, 1903
SEVENTH EDITION, *July*, 1904; EIGHTH EDITION,
April, 1905; NINTH EDITION, *July*, 1908.

PREFACE.

'In proportion as we lose truth more and victory less, we shall become anxious to know what it is which leads our opponents to think as they do. We shall begin to suspect that the pertinacity of belief exhibited by them must result from a perception of something we have not perceived. And we shall aim to supplement the portion of truth we have found with the portion found by them.'—HERBERT SPENCER, "First Principles," part of § 3.

THIS volume is published in response to requests from numerous friends who desire to have, in a permanent form, the Lectures delivered on Sunday afternoons at South Place Institute, during 1888-89 and 1891, on "Centres of Spiritual Activity," and "Phases of Religious Development."

The Lectures were first designed to explain and illustrate the different Religious Movements of the day, for though most thinking persons are fully persuaded of their own belief, they are often unable to understand the standpoint of others equally earnest, and thus fail to do justice to men of different creeds. After the current divisions of Christianity and Modern Ethical Philosophies had been treated, it was thought that Ancient Religious Systems might also be profitably studied in the same manner, especially as the general public have very little opportunity of becoming acquainted with them, and not unfrequently mistake their mere accidents for their spirit and substance.

Some of the Lecturers have been so kind as to re-write their essays for this volume, while the articles on the Religion of Egypt, Shintôism (second article), Zoroastrianism, Religions of Ancient Greece and Rome, Hittites, Quakers, Irvingism, and Evolution have been specially written for the present edition.

The willingness with which the various Lecturers have come forward, without fee or reward, to speak on his or her special topic, to audiences not always sympathetic—in some cases at the risk, almost certainty, of offending their own co-religionists—and the sympathy expressed by several eminent men, who from various causes were unable to take a personal part in the course, have been very encouraging to those who organized the series of lectures.

That a publication of this kind meets a distinct want is clearly shown by the fact that the first edition was exhausted within a few months of issue. It is hoped that the present work will, owing to its greater completeness, be even more widely appreciated. It is published simultaneously in England and America.

WM. SHEOWRING, } *Hon. Sec.*
CONRAD W. THIES, } *Institute Committee.*

CONTENTS.

PART I.—PRE-CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN.

	PAGE
THE EGYPTIAN RELIGION	Professor C. P. Tiele, D.D. 3
THE RELIGION OF THE HITTITES	Thomas Tyler, M.A. 10
THE RELIGION OF BABYLONIA	W. St. Chad Boscawen 15
THE RELIGION OF ASSYRIA	Canon George Rawlinson 26
ANCIENT JUDAISM.	Rev. A. W. Oxford 42
THE RELIGION OF CHINA	Professor James Legge 61
TAOISM	F. H. Balfour 76
THE RELIGIONS OF JAPAN	C. Pfundes 92
SHINTOISM (1)	Dagors Goh 99
SHINTOISM (2)	Isabella Bird (Mrs. Bishop) 102
HINDUISM	Sir Alfred Lyall 112
OLD INDIAN POETRY, ETC.	Mrs. Frederika Macdonald 126
BUDDHISM	Professor T. W. Rhys-Davids 142
BUDDHA AND BUDDHISM	Mrs. Frederika Macdonald 152
BUDDHISM IN CHINA	Professor Samuel Beal 166
ZOROASTRIANISM	L. H. Mills, D.D. 180
THE PARSİ RELIGION	Hon. Dadabhai Naoroji 184
MITHRAISM	John M. Robertson 194
THE GREEK AND LATIN RELIGIONS	Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart., M.A. 216
THE INFLUENCE OF PAGANISM ON CHRISTIANITY	C. F. Keary 246
THE SLAVONIC RELIGION	W. R. Morfill 260
TEUTONIC HEATHENDOM	Professor F. York Powell, M.A. 278
MUHAMMADANISM.	G. W. Leitner, LL.D. 292
SIKHISM	Frederic Pincott 301
SUPRISM.	E. G. Browne 314
BABISM	E. G. Browne 333
THE RELIGIONS OF ANCIENT AMERICA	John M. Robertson 354

• PART II.—CHRISTIAN, THEISTIC, AND PHILOSOPHIC.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH	F. C. Conybeare, M.A. 379
THE GREEK CHURCH	N. Orloff, M.A. 405
THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.	N. Orloff, M.A. 418
THE CHURCH CATHOLIC	B. F. C. Costelloe, M.A. 442

	PAGE.
THE MASS	<i>B. F. C. Costelloe, M.A.</i> . . . 462
THE RELIGION OF DANTE	<i>Oscar Browning, M.A.</i> . . . 483
OLD CATHOLICISM	<i>Rev. R. S. Oldham, M.A.</i> . . . 498
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	<i>Canon Shuttleworth, M.A.</i> . . . 508
NONCONFORMITY	<i>J. Allanson Picton, M.A., M.P.</i> 520
PRESBYTERIANISM	<i>Rev. David Fotheringham</i> . . . 531
INDEPENDENCY	<i>Rev. Edward White, D.D.</i> . . . 552
THE BAPTISTS	<i>Rev. John Clifford, D.D.</i> . . . 559
THE QUAKERS	<i>William Pollard</i> 575
METHODISM	<i>Mrs. Sheldon Amos</i> 585
IRVINGISM	<i>Rev. Edward Miller, M.A.</i> . . . 594
THE UNITARIANS	<i>Rev. Henry W. Crosskey, LL.D.</i> 602
THEISM	<i>Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A.</i> . . . 620
MYSTICISM	<i>W. S. Lilly</i> 631
THEOSOPHY	<i>Mrs. Besant</i> 646
SWEDENBORGIANISM	<i>Rev. Thomas Child</i> 652
THE MORMONS	<i>Elder J. H. Anderson</i> 657
THE JEWS IN MODERN TIMES	<i>Professor D. W. Marks</i> 683
JEWISH ETHICS	<i>Rev. Morris Joseph</i> 695
SPINOZA	<i>Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., M.A.</i> 709
THE RELIGION OF NATURE (ROUSSEAU)	<i>Mrs. Frederika Macdonald.</i> . . . 724
HUMANITY	<i>Frederic Harrison</i> 739
THE RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF SKEPTICISM	<i>Rev. John Owen, M.A.</i> 752
THE EVOLUTION THEORY	<i>Miss Bevington</i> 768
THE ETHICAL MOVEMENT	<i>Dr. Stanton Coit</i> 787
SECULARISM	<i>G. W. Foote</i> 794
A NATIONAL CHURCH	<i>Arthur W. Hutton, M.A.</i> . . . 806
INDEX 820

PART I.

PRE-CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN.

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD

THE EGYPTIAN RELIGION.

BY C. P. TIELE, D.D., LL.D.

*Professor of the History and Philosophy of Religion in the
University of Leiden.*

WHEN the student turns his attention to the Religion of the Ancient Egyptians, he is at once confronted with the disputed question as to its essential character. The discovery of Champollion enabled his pupils and their successors to advance from the scanty notices of the Greek classical writers and the fragments of Manetho, to the study and elucidation of the original Egyptian sources ; and as these sources multiplied, much new light was shed upon the nature of the Religion. But, as usually happens in such cases, the more this knowledge increased, the more clearly did its limitation appear, and the more questions remained unsolved. When the student consults the works of the Egyptologists, he still finds himself compelled to choose between two diametrically opposite theories. The advocates of the one view see in the Egyptian Religion what amounts to a pure monotheism, exhibiting itself through the manifestly silly or even barbaric forms of a multiform polytheism, with the loftiest ideas hidden like a pure gem in the crude shell of magical arts and symbolical notions. The advocates of the other view see in it a religion which is still really barbaric, animistic, and therianthropic, and to which priests and scribes endeavoured to give a mystical sense—a sense not understood by the people, and one which left the superstitious practices undisturbed. Both views are maintained, with great knowledge and talent, by celebrated scholars ; and they are supported by texts which seem to prove completely those different positions. As a matter of fact, the existence of a certain contradiction in the bosom of the Egyptian Religion cannot be denied ; nor can it, in my opinion, be satisfactorily explained by either of these views. Even if we could accept as a fact the existence of such a pure and lofty religion in pre-historic times, it yet appears to me inconceivable that, just as the civilization of the people increased, their religion should of itself, and without any accessory causes, have degenerated into such a gross fetishism and into such silly sorcery, accompanied, as it was, by senseless formulas, which those who muttered them did not themselves understand. And still less can I suppose that such a sublime conception of God, and such

evidence of, could have been developed out of so decidedly an animistic form of worship, as the Egyptian must originally have been, solely under the influence of a rich but—in the main—materialistic civilization. We are therefore compelled to regard the Egyptian Religion, as it appears in history, as presenting the fusion of two heterogeneous elements, and as having arisen out of the mixing of two very differently endowed races. In other words, the National Religion of Egypt was—and continued to be—a genuine Nigritian polydæmonism, with which a ruling minority (belonging to races which came from Asia in pre-historic times, and which became the ruling class) tried to unite their own purer religious ideas by giving to that polydæmonism a mystic, symbolical meaning. It is only by this hypothesis that the otherwise apparently insoluble contradictions in the Egyptian Religion can be satisfactorily explained.

Among the older aboriginal elements must be reckoned two things which were specially characteristic of the Egyptian Religion, viz., the Worship of Animals, and the Worship of the Dead, especially dead Kings. Worship of Animals has been found to be very common in antiquity, and among barbarous and uncivilized peoples. But it nowhere reached such a height as in Egypt. The animals worshipped were those which were distinguished by extraordinary qualities, real or imagined, and regarded as evidencing magical power; those which were specially feared or valued; and, above all, those which were supposed to stand in a certain mysterious connection with the origin of all life and prosperity in Egypt—the periodic overflow of the Nile. Every tribe and district, every place and family, had its own sacred animal; but certain animals—the bull, the crocodile, the cat, the hippopotamus, and others—were for special reasons very generally worshipped. Originally nothing but fetishes, which they continued to be for the great majority of the worshippers, they were brought by the doctrinal expositions and by the educated classes into connection with certain particular gods, and thus came to be regarded as the terrestrial incarnation of these gods.

The Worship of the Dead and of the Dead Kings, took the foremost place in the Religion of Egypt. Nowhere has there been so much care bestowed on the construction and ornamentation of tombs, and on the preservation of the bodies of the dead, nor so much treasure applied to these purposes, as in Egypt. Of all the magical texts, the most sacred and cherished were those which were collected in the so-called Book of the Dead; and so, too, the most sacred and precious rites were those which had reference to embalming and entombing, or to the life after death. In its origin the care of the dead was as animistic as the worship of animals, and at first it had no other aim than to provide for them security from their persecutions or punishments, by making them want for nothing even in the grave, and arming them against the terrible demons of the kingdom of darkness. And so much were these demons feared, that the individual

even in his lifetime took care to be secured against them by the provision of a strong tomb and rich endowments. But even these usages, to which the people remained so much attached from no higher motive than the one indicated, had a deeper meaning gradually given to them by the priests and the more cultivated members of the community. Myths which arose independently, and from which the worship of the dead certainly cannot have sprung, were closely attached to it; and mystical union with a dying and living god became the pledge of the survival of the individual, to which certain moral requirements were afterwards added by the doctrine of retribution.

To the non-African elements, on the other hand, belong the oldest chief myths of Egypt: those of Osiris and of Rê or Râ, of which the former were localized at Abydos, and also in some places of Northern Egypt, and the latter especially at Anu (On) or Heliopolis. They soon came to be moulded into a certain whole by the priests of the latter place, and they constitute the religious basis of the eschatology. They are forms of well-known myths which are found among many nations of antiquity; one of the light and dark, two beneficent and dreaded brothers, representing the alternation of the seasons, the struggle between fertility and sterility in nature, between cultivation and rude strength in society, and transferred in its ultimate form to the first human beings and the oldest social union; the other of the god of light, victorious over the serpent of darkness, and ever reviving after a temporary overthrow.

Within our limited space we cannot give an extended description and explanation of these myths, nor an enumeration of the principal gods of the Egyptian mythology. Suffice it to say that Osiris, who, after being killed by his brother Set, is avenged by his son Horos, but does not return to the world of the living, becomes the god of the dead, *par excellence*, the sovereign of the Kingdom of the Dead, with whom every dead person identified himself. Traces of his former more general significance may still be often found, after the restriction of his domain to the other world; but they only become prominent when, during the last centuries of Egypt's existence, he becomes again the highest god. Râ, on the contrary, the father of gods and men, and as such the first ruler on earth becomes more and more the national god of Egypt, with whom in the course of time all the principal gods of Egypt are identified.

This did not, however, take place before the Egyptian Religion had passed through several centuries of development. At the outset there cannot have existed anything like unity in this religion. Different, albeit kindred, cults existed in comparative independence alongside of each other; and it was only where a powerful lord succeeded in uniting several provinces into one kingdom, over which he held the sovereignty, that the principal god of his seat of government became the sovereign of the local gods, the latter being grouped around the former as his relatives and courtiers. The same thing took place when the two great kingdoms of Upper and Lower

Egypt were founded, and again when these two were united under one sceptre. It is true that Râ and Osiris, with the gods of their circle, remained the general national gods, and the chief towns of their worship, Heliopolis and Abydos, sacred cities *par excellence*; but in the official cult the principal god of the residency had the priority, and the other divinities of the most important centres were placed side by side with him in his temple, or in other sanctuaries, as his subordinates. During the Ancient Empire, which flourished under the first six dynasties, this place was held by Ptah of Memphis, the forming or creating god, with whom the Greeks compared their Hephæstos. During the Middle Empire, which reached its culminating point under the twelfth dynasty, this place was held by Sebak or Sovku, the crocodile god—hence a Nile-god—who, introduced from the south, got his imperial temple in or near the labyrinth within the region which had been lately watered by canals, the Fayum (sea-land). During the New Empire, beginning with the eighteenth dynasty, the chief god was Amun of Thebes. Later on, certain gods from the Delta, especially Neith of Saïs, were elevated to the highest rank, although they never obtained the same amount of honour. And by the side of these gods of the reigning dynasty certain famous ancient gods were considered as their equals: such as Chnum, the architect, the god of the cataracts, who shapes man on his potter's wheel, and was worshipped in more than one place as the Creator; Thôt (Dhuti), the god of the moon, who had become the god of time, of writing, of the word, and consequently the special god of the priests; Hathor, whose cult was so widely spread that her name was also used for "goddess" in general, as Horos was used for "god"; and several others. The ignorant multitude were not scandalized by this abundance of supreme gods, every one of which was declared by his priests to be the god of gods. But the more cultivated and thoughtful members of the community could find no satisfaction in it. An explanation must needs be sought; and it was found in the doctrine, which slowly developed itself and soon became generally adopted, that all these principal gods were different revelations or shapes of the highest god Râ, and his name was added to theirs.

With this, however, all the contradictions were not yet resolved. It was only the higher gods that could be considered as shapes of Râ; but what of many hundreds of others? Polytheism has always a tendency to multiply itself. Where there are many gods the number of them ever goes on increasing, whether as personifications of phenomena hitherto unnoticed or unappreciated, or as protectors of new inventions, trades, and customs, or as local genii of spots where an important event had taken place. Such was the case everywhere in antiquity. Besides, in Egypt the extended intercourse with foreign nations under the New Empire, and the settlement of foreign tribes in the valley of the Nile, caused the pantheon to increase largely by the introduction of new gods. At the same time an always stronger striving after monotheism revealed itself. How were these

two tendencies to be combined? How were the priests to justify the belief in so many gods and the continuance of their worship, if they talked of one god, as they often did? This was effected in different ways. The many gods were names of the One God, or his revelations, or his numerous members created by himself. Thus monotheism was maintained in theory; but as no limits were assigned by it to polytheism, and the right of the latter to existence was recognised, it remained without any practical result for the popular religion.

At this point the development of the Egyptian Religion stopped. At least one effort to take the decisive step of introducing monotheism as the religion of the State, failed most completely. I refer to King Amenothès IV.'s reformation, over which great light has been shed through documents recently found; but the sudden growth, rapid victory, and as rapid suppression of the effort leaves much which puzzles us. It seems to have originated in the school of Heliopolis, where the king was already a priest before his accession, a title which he always continued to bear. Envy of the haughty priesthood of Amun-Râ at Thebes may have contributed to it; for the members of that priesthood, which eclipsed all others, had caused high priestly offices at the oldest and most venerable centres to be occupied by their sons and favourites, and of the revenues destined for the cult out of the State treasury (in this case the royal treasury) they devoured no less than three-fourths. Perhaps, too, the young prince longed to free himself from the tyrannical authority which the priests of the capital exercised over the king. However it was, no sooner had he succeeded his father than he founded a temple at Thebes for the Heliopolitan god, whose worship had been growing during the last years of Amenothès III., and which the young prince wanted to introduce as the only one recognised by the State. This god was the sun-god, commonly known by the name of Aten-Râ (E'n-Rê), the sun-disk, though he also worshipped him under other names. Soon after, whether urged on solely by fanatical zeal, or incited by resistance, he is no longer to be restrained. He builds for himself a new capital, near the present el-Amarna, with one single temple for his god, calls it after him, Chu-n-aten (soul of the sun-disk), changes his own name into Chu-n-aten, demands an exclusive worship of Aten-Râ, leaves the detested Thebes, and persecutes the service of Amun-Râ especially with merciless zeal. Wherever he can he causes the name of this god to be erased, his images to be destroyed, his sanctuaries to fall to ruins like those of all the other gods. He does not tolerate images of the divinity any longer; his own god alone may be represented by a symbol. If he experienced opposition—which is very probable—it proved powerless. Chu-n-aten carried out his reformation, and maintained it during his reign. Such was the power of the king in Egypt, of the son of the sun, the representative of the divinity on earth. But not long after his death, it appeared that the greater part of the nation had yielded only to violence. He had no sons to succeed him, only

sons-in-law. But one of them was overcome by the reaction, which now set in with force, and was converted to Amun-Râ. And he who was chosen by the priests of Amun, in order as king to re-establish the old order of things, was that same Har-em-hebi, who, either under Chu-n-aten himself or under one of his sons-in-law, had been a zealous votary of Aten-Râ, as commander-in-chief of the army and chief governor of the kingdom, and second only to the king. The royal reformer had overstepped the mark. Perhaps monotheism, introduced in another manner, and not imposed by mere compulsion and authority, might have been slowly received, at least by the more civilized classes, and even been diffused in Egypt; but this would only have been possible if it had attached itself to the mighty service of Amun, and required worship of this god only. Yet even this can only be regarded as possible, not as probable. The Egyptian Religion was composed of too widely different elements for a perfect unity to arise from them, and neither of its two chief elements was powerful enough to quite eliminate the other. It has not been able to rise higher than the semi-panteistic speculation of the Theban school.

If we were called upon to characterize the Egyptian Religion in a few words, we should call it, both as a system and as a cult, an almost monarchical polytheism in a theocratic form. The Egyptian polytheism was not purely monarchical, for there were several divine monarchies; and only by the somewhat arbitrary doctrine that all the chief gods were in reality the same under different names, could the semblance of monarchy be maintained. But this religion was undoubtedly theocratic in the strictest sense of the word. The divinity himself reigned through his son, the absolute king, his incarnation and representative on earth. The priesthood of Amun, strengthened by its victory over the heretic, and by the measureless wealth which the munificence of successful conquerors poured into its lap, had attained the most tremendous power in the State; and when, after a long time, its members had reduced the kings to weak tools in their hands, and succeeded at last in usurping the throne itself, the theocracy was altered in form only, but not in its essence. The place of the King-highpriest was taken by the Highpriest-king. But even this change was of short duration. Against another power no less favoured by the kings of the new empire, the power of the army (composed for the greater part of hired foreign troops), the priestly princes proved unable to keep their ground. They had to leave the country, and in Ethiopia they founded a new sacerdotal kingdom. Still the rule of the kings, who sprang from this military revolution, was purely theocratic.

But this only characterizes the form of the Egyptian Religion. If we search for the leading thought, contained in all its myths and symbols, and in all its institutions and ceremonies, it may best be comprised in the word "life." "For millions of years" is a constantly recurring expression. The sign of life (*ankh*) is the holiest and the most commonly used of all the symbols. The gods bear it in their hands, hold it to the lips of their

worshippers, and pour it out in streams over the heads of their favourites. For they actually give life, now by the light which they continually cause to triumph over the powers of darkness, again by the regular recurrence of the fructifying waters, or by mysterious operations in the centre of the earth. And hence they set such store on the possession of the lawful king. He, the son of the sun, was the living pledge that these blessings should not cease. His coronation was an agricultural festival, the beginning of the harvest; his greatest care was to spread the waters of the Nile through canals as far as possible over the fields. From this arose also their great fear of death and eternal darkness, and the efforts and sacrifices which they made to secure an eternal existence, either in the fertile land of Osiris, or as a follower of the god of light, and, as it is put, "to obtain the crown of life."

Entirely swayed by these ideas, the Egyptian, although his religious thinking did not stand still, clung to the existing state of things with an unequalled persistency. Although not scorning new and strange things, he did not relinquish what was old. He may have connected different ideas with it; but the holy texts which he muttered during the Ptolemean era were often the same as those his ancestors had uttered at the altars and the tombs more than thirty centuries ago. The nature of the land which bore and fed him had imprinted a peculiar stamp on his religion. Moreover, his religion became to him more and more the only thing of supreme value. Treasures, the fruits of his industry, and all the skill which was the product of his remarkable civilization, he spent on the building and the decorating of his tombs and temples. Those of Amun at Thebes gradually became the largest in the world. His whole literature, even that which was not destined for a religious purpose, is, with a few exceptions, saturated by a religious spirit. He bore willingly enough the yoke of foreign rulers who adored his gods, who built his temples, who endowed his priests and respected his rites; but to kill one of his holy animals, or insult one of his gods, was sufficient to make him unfurl the banner of revolt. The high antiquity, the peculiar forms of its gods, and its strange ceremonies, which were for the greater part only survivals of an era of lower development but with a mystical haze diffused over them, gave to this religion, in the eyes of the younger peoples of Europe, something venerable and mysterious. In Osiris and Isis, who, as religious conceptions, were considerably inferior to Zeus or Athene, Greeks and Romans sought satisfaction for religious wants, which they considered that their own gods could not satisfy. And Serapis, who in reality was nothing but a dead Hapi-bull, became the All-god, in whom were united Zeus, Pluton, and Helios.

THE RELIGION OF THE HITTITES.

BY THOMAS TYLER, M.A.

IN complying with the request that I would write a contribution to this volume on the Religion of the Hittites, I cannot conceal from myself a considerable difficulty, which arises from the fragmentary nature of our present sources of knowledge. The monuments as yet discovered are few, and, probably enough, some of these are separated widely one from another in respect of time. There are, besides, some notices in the Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions, and others in certain of the books of the Old Testament. But though from these sources of information, taken together, it is not possible to obtain complete information, yet we may arrive at some conclusions which may be regarded as certain, and at others which are highly probable. There is a variety in the names used in the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Hebrew authorities, but there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that the same peoples are intended.

One of the chief causes which give interest to the Religion of the Hittites, is the probability that it was this religion which prevailed in early times in Syria and in Canaan itself—the destined residence of the Theocratic people. A treaty between Rameses II. and the Khita, or Hittites, dating about 1300 B.C., has come down to us, in which there is a list of the gods of the land of Khita. The name of Astartha, or Ashtoreth, is to be found in this list, but that most frequently occurring is given by Egyptologists as *Sutekh*, though the true pronunciation of the final syllable is by no means certain. It has been, indeed, thought not unlikely that this *Sutekh*, who appears to have been a solar deity, is to be identified with the *Shaddai* mentioned in Exodus vi. 3, and elsewhere. The passage in Exodus may be thus translated: "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as EL SHADDAL, but as to My name JEHOVAH I was not known to them." This ancient deity in Palestine would thus have to be identified with the Egyptian god Set, or Seti, of whom the late Dr. Birch observed, "In the Egyptian mythology he appears as the evil principle, and also the sun-god. But the great interest of the god Set was his connection with the Hykshos and Canaanites, when he generally bears the name of Sutekh or Sut. As such he was worshipped during the shepherd rule in Amaris; after which his worship still continued, apparently in connection with Baal, and he was the type of Northern, as Horus of Southern, Egypt. . . . He was the chief god of the Khita [*i.e.*, Hittites], and at a later period, for reasons unknown, either religious or political, his name was erased from the public monuments. . . . One idea is, that his name

was the most ancient one of God amongst the Semitic races" (Dr. S. Birch in Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, ed. 1878, vol. 3, pp. 144, 145).

Prof. Sayce some time ago (*Modern Review*, Oct., 1882, p. 857) put forth the "tentative suggestion" that the name JEHOVAH may have been derived from the Hittites. In behalf of this suggestion he pointed to the use of "Jehovah" in forming the names of certain princes of the Hittite city Hamath, whence were obtained a few years ago several important Hittite inscriptions now at Constantinople. The name of one of the Hamathite kings referred to by Professor Sayce is *Jahu-bidi* or *Yahu-bidi*, a name found in the Assyrian inscriptions. But besides this there is the name *Joram* in the Second Book of Samuel (viii. 9, 10): "When Toi king of Hamath heard that David had smitten all the host of Hadadezer, then Toi sent Joram his son unto king David, to salute him, and to bless him, because he had fought against Hadadezer, and smitten him: for Hadadezer had wars with Toi." The writer in the Chronicles, not liking, apparently, that a prince outside Israel, and belonging to an alien race, should bear a name compounded with the sacred name *Jehovah*, gives, instead of *Joram*, the name *Hadoram*, the latter name being formed with that of the Syrian god Hadad (1 Chron. xviii. 10). But the fact appears to be, that, as was the case with other deities in other countries, the cult, or, at least, some respect for the name, of the God of Israel, *Jehovah*, extended after a time beyond the boundaries of Israel. There is in the British Museum a small coin which has been thought to come from a city on the Philistine coast, and which, as shown by the letters inscribed upon it, represents *Jehovah*, though after the fashion in which the Greek Zeus or the Roman Jupiter was represented, seated in a chariot, and with other congruous attributes.

The name *Jehovah*, though not of Hittite origin, was, nevertheless, in all probability, a foreign name. It seems to me most likely that it was derived from the name of the Vedic deity *Dyaus*, a name which gave birth likewise to *Zeus*, and to *Jupiter*, *Jovis*. It most probably came to the Hebrews through traffic with India, by way of Chaldea and the Persian Gulf. *Dyaus* was a god of the sky; and the derivation I have thus indicated may make it a little more easy to understand the designation *Jehovah Tsebaoth*, "The LORD of hosts," that is, in all probability, of the stars, the heavenly hosts. The explanation given in Exod. iii. 14 has been rejected by distinguished scholars; and it probably originated in accordance with the well-known method by which foreign names, imported into a language, and whose origin and meaning have been lost through lapse of time, come to be treated as native-born words, and explained accordingly. It would not be very difficult to find examples more or less analogous in our own language.

The treaty with Rameses shows, as we have seen, that Ashtoreth was a Hittite goddess. She was also a principal deity of the Phœnicians, though the origin of the name is to be traced to the Mesopotamian and Chaldean *Ishtar*. She comes before us in the Old Testament as the "Queen of

Heaven," that is, the Moon, in whose honour certain cakes were made; a custom said to be still observed in or near the same localities. As the new moon is regarded as horned, it is easy to understand Ashtoreth being represented with the head of a horned cow. It is probably in connection with this representation that we should understand the name Ashteroth-karnaim, *i.e.*, "Ashteroth of the two horns" (Gen. xiv. 5). And on one of the inscriptions from the Hittite city Hamath, already alluded to, this goddess is undoubtedly represented by a crescent moon with one of its horns terminating in a horned ox-head. And on a Hittite seal in the British Museum, from Yuzgât in Asia Minor, there is represented the winged solar disk, similar in some measure to figures which are to be seen on the Assyrian monuments, but having on each side of it ox-headed figures with human-shaped bodies in the act of adoration, the Moon thus, as it were, confessing the Sun's superiority.

In a number of passages in the Old Testament is to be found the word *Asherah*, which the Authorized Version renders somewhat incongruously by "grove." As an example, may be adduced 2 Kings xxi. 7, "And he set a graven image of the grove that he had made in the house, of which the LORD said to David, and to Solomon his son, In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all tribes of Israel, will I put my name for ever." A "graven image of a grove" must certainly have been something remarkable. The Revised Version, in the passages cited and elsewhere, preserves the original Hebrew word in the form "*Asherah*," (Of this *Asherah* it has been said, "This symbol seems in all cases to have been of wood, and the most probable etymology of the term indicates that it was formed of the straight stem of a tree, whether living or set up for the purpose, and thus points to the phallic rites with which no doubt the worship of Astarte was connected" (the late Prof. Gotch, in *Smith's Dictionary*). The "graven image of *Asherah*" probably implied a certain amount of sculpture with the view of closer representation. It then became an "abomination" or "horror" (R. V. "an abominable image for an *Asherah*"), 1 Kings xv. 13. *Asherah*, "the straight," was, however, closely connected with Ashtoreth—a connection in no way difficult to understand, if we recollect those licentious rites connected with the worship of Ashtoreth just alluded to. And Ashtoreth, as mentioned above, was a moon-goddess. It is interesting to find that in the inscriptions from Jerablûs, probably the ancient Carchemish, in the British Museum, a straight symbol is again and again found by the side of a crescent-moon, the combination evidently being an object of worship, in fact, a symbol of deity. It is always, or with scarcely an exception, found at the top of the line, above other objects and symbols. It is to be seen above a sacred tree or other consecrated objects, and the hand is held up to it in worship.

Connected with the worship of the Sun, the King of Heaven, was probably that of the Eagle, the Bird of the Sun. It is in this way, as seems likely, that Chemosh, as a solar deity, is represented by an eagle in the

symbol of the name Car-chemish. But, whatever may be the truth with regard to this explanation, which, however, seems to me in a high degree probable, the evidence of coins shows that the cult of the eagle existed in the country near Carchemish to a much later date. And the eagle or hawk is a well-known Egyptian Symbol of Horus, the Rising Sun.

I have yet to speak of what is perhaps the most curious fact in relation to the Hittite religion—the sacredness of the triangle, or rather, perhaps it should be said, of the equilateral triangle. This fact was not discovered till some four years ago, and then the discovery was made by the examination of a seal with five engraved faces, now in the Ashmolean Museum, which had been found near Tarsus, and had been brought to this country by the Rev. Greville Chester. Previously the occurrence of the equilateral triangle had been observed, as, for example, on the seal from Yuzgât already mentioned; and on the Carthaginian monuments it had been noticed that there was frequently to be seen a triangle with what looked like a rude representation of a head and projecting arms at the apex; but of this figure no satisfactory explanation had been given. On the Tarsus seal, however, were to be seen most curious figures, resembling to a certain extent the headed triangle of the Carthaginian monuments, but with such modifications and such accompanying figures as to suggest not only a mystical signification, but also to imply, or render probable, that the equilateral triangle, by virtue of its geometrical properties, was regarded as of widespread potency, or even as the source of life. The idea of three-in-oneness represented by the triangle is exhibited also on the Tarsus seal by the trident; but of the curious scenes represented on the five faces of this seal it is scarcely possible to give an adequate idea without the aid of figures. Further research showed not only a widespread use of symbols apparently derived from the triangle, but suggested the possibility that the Egyptian symbol of life, the *crux ansata*, or *ankh*, was also at a period of exceedingly remote antiquity, derived from the headed triangle. There is strong reason, also, to believe, on the evidence of a broken tablet in the British Museum, that in Babylonia the equilateral triangle had the meaning "life." I ought to add that, in the Louvre, is a very curious impression from a Hittite seal obtained in Asia Minor. On this seal the triangle has, apparently, eyes. The symbol of a hand is held up to it in supplication. The base is curved downwards, either to denote an inclination towards the worshipper, or possibly to represent a fulness of divine influence, a stream of which is issuing from one of the corners. This stream is, as I take it, analogous to the streams represented on Babylonian seals as issuing from the deity towards the worshipper—a curious fact which was detected by Dr. Hayes Ward, of New York.

With two general statements I may conclude. The first is, that, so far as we can at present see, the writing on the Hittite monuments is, with the partial exception of proper names, pictorial or ideographic, that is, that it pictures objects and ideas, and does not represent sounds. Attempts have

Heaven," that is, the Moon, in whose honour certain cakes were made; a custom said to be still observed in or near the same localities. As the new moon is regarded as horned, it is easy to understand Ashtoreth being represented with the head of a horned cow. It is probably in connection with this representation that we should understand the name *Ashteroth-karnaim*, i.e., "Ashteroth of the two horns" (Gen. xiv. 5). And on one of the inscriptions from the Hittite city Hamath, already alluded to, this goddess is undoubtedly represented by a crescent moon with one of its horns terminating in a horned ox-head. And on a Hittite seal in the British Museum, from Yuzgât in Asia Minor, there is represented the winged solar disk, similar in some measure to figures which are to be seen on the Assyrian monuments, but having on each side of it ox-headed figures with human-shaped bodies in the act of adoration, the Moon thus, as it were, confessing the Sun's superiority.

In a number of passages in the Old Testament is to be found the word *Asherah*, which the Authorized Version renders somewhat incongruously by "grove." As an example, may be adduced 2 Kings xxi. 7, "And he set a graven image of the grove that he had made in the house, of which the LORD said to David, and to Solomon his son, In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all tribes of Israel, will I put my name for ever." A "graven image of a grove" must certainly have been something remarkable. The Revised Version, in the passages cited and elsewhere, preserves the original Hebrew word in the form "*Asherah*." Of this *Asherah* it has been said, "This symbol seems in all cases to have been of wood, and the most probable etymology of the term indicates that it was formed of the straight stem of a tree, whether living or set up for the purpose, and thus points to the phallic rites with which no doubt the worship of Astarte was connected" (the late Prof. Gotch, in *Smith's Dictionary*). The "graven image of *Asherah*" probably implied a certain amount of sculpture with the view of closer representation. It then became an "abomination" or "horror" (R. V. "an abominable image for an *Asherah*"), 1 Kings xv. 13. *Asherah*, "the straight," was, however, closely connected with Ashtoreth—a connection in no way difficult to understand, if we recollect those licentious rites connected with the worship of Ashtoreth just alluded to. And Ashtoreth, as mentioned above, was a moon-goddess. It is interesting to find that in the inscriptions from Jerablâs, probably the ancient Carchemish, in the British Museum, a straight symbol is again and again found by the side of a crescent-moon, the combination evidently being an object of worship, in fact, a symbol of deity. It is always, or with scarcely an exception, found at the top of the line, above other objects and symbols. It is to be seen above a sacred tree or other consecrated objects, and the hand is held up to it in worship.

Connected with the worship of the Sun, the King of Heaven, was probably that of the Eagle, the Bird of the Sun. It is in this way, as seems likely, that Chemosh, as a solar deity, is represented by an eagle in the

symbol of the name Car-chenish. But, whatever may be the truth with regard to this explanation, which, however, seems to me in a high degree probable, the evidence of coins shows that the cult of the eagle existed in the country near Carchemish to a much later date. And the eagle or hawk is a well-known Egyptian Symbol of Horus, the Rising Sun.

I have yet to speak of what is perhaps the most curious fact in relation to the Hittite religion—the sacredness of the triangle, or rather, perhaps it should be said, of the equilateral triangle. This fact was not discovered till some four years ago, and then the discovery was made by the examination of a seal with five engraved faces, now in the Ashmolean Museum, which had been found near Tarsus, and had been brought to this country by the Rev. Greville Chester. Previously the occurrence of the equilateral triangle had been observed, as, for example, on the seal from Yuzgât already mentioned; and on the Carthaginian monuments it had been noticed that there was frequently to be seen a triangle with what looked like a rude representation of a head and projecting arms at the apex; but of this figure no satisfactory explanation had been given. On the Tarsus seal, however, were to be seen most curious figures, resembling to a certain extent the headed triangle of the Carthaginian monuments, but with such modifications and such accompanying figures as to suggest not only a mystical signification, but also to imply, or render probable, that the equilateral triangle, by virtue of its geometrical properties, was regarded as of widespread potency, or even as the source of life. The idea of three-in-oneness represented by the triangle is exhibited also on the Tarsus seal by the trident; but of the curious scenes represented on the five faces of this seal it is scarcely possible to give an adequate idea without the aid of figures. Further research showed not only a widespread use of symbols apparently derived from the triangle, but suggested the possibility that the Egyptian symbol of life, the *crux ansata*, or *ankh*, was also at a period of exceedingly remote antiquity, derived from the headed triangle. There is strong reason, also, to believe, on the evidence of a broken tablet in the British Museum, that in Babylonia the equilateral triangle had the meaning "life." I ought to add that, in the Louvre, is a very curious impression from a Hittite seal obtained in Asia Minor. On this seal the triangle has, apparently, eyes. The symbol of a hand is held up to it in supplication. The base is curved downwards, either to denote an inclination towards the worshipper, or possibly to represent a fulness of divine influence, a stream of which is issuing from one of the corners. This stream is, as I take it, analogous to the streams represented on Babylonian seals as issuing from the deity towards the worshipper—a curious fact which was detected by Dr. Hayes Ward, of New York.

With two general statements I may conclude. The first is, that, so far as we can at present see, the writing on the Hittite monuments is with the partial exception of proper names, pictorial or ideographic, that is, that it pictures objects and ideas, and does not represent sounds. Attempts have

been made to show that the inscriptions are alphabetic or syllabic ; but these attempts can scarcely be regarded as other than failures. The second is, that though the Hittite symbols may very possibly have been used by peoples speaking other dialects, the evidence looks in the direction of the Semitic languages, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac ; and this fact gives the Hittite inscriptions and the Hittite religion especial interest and importance in relation to the religious history of Israel.*

* If the reader wishes to pursue the subject further, I may mention that there is a good deal of additional information relating to the Hittite monuments, illustrated by figures, in five articles which I contributed to *Nature*, March 29th to April 26th, 1888. I hope, after a time, to republish the substance of these articles, with additions.

THE RELIGION OF BABYLONIA.

BY W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN.

IN coming before a mixed audience, to lecture on the Religion of Babylonia, I feel that I stand in a different position from the lecturers who have preceded me. Unlike the learned scholars who have spoken to you regarding the teachings, creeds, and ceremonies of Buddhism, Hinduism, or Mohammedanism, I can bring before you no sacred canon of books upon which to base my analysis of this ancient religion. Among the sacred writings of the land of Chaldea, we find no class of works which can be studied in the same systematic manner or submitted to the same analysis as the *Vedas*, the *Sutras*, or the *Quran*. There is another difficulty which we encounter upon the threshold of the exposition of the principal features of the history of religious development in Chaldea. It carries us back to so remote an antiquity, before the birth of the most ancient of the religions with which we are familiar, and which have formed the data upon which the students of the science of comparative religions have formulated the laws governing the growth of religions in general, that it is extremely difficult to trace its growth and development in accordance with those laws which are applicable to the Aryan and other systems.

Our earliest inscriptions from the cities of Southern Chaldea carry us back to a period certainly long prior to B.C. 3800; and yet these inscriptions prove that religion had already passed through more than one of the earlier stages of development. Animism or Shamanism, the crude cultus of the magician and sorcerer, ever in contact with the evil opponents in nature, the spirits which waged war against man, had passed away and given place to the worship of the Creator God (*Dimmera*). While, however, this progress had been attained, and a crude theocracy formulated, yet the older creeds still lingered on and intermingled with the religion of the period; and fragments of their litanies and liturgies are still preserved to us.

It is in this mixed character of the religion in the inscriptions that one of our chief difficulties is found.

The sacred literature is by no means scanty; thousands of tablets exist in our museums, which contain prayers, litanies, and liturgical texts. Our difficulty lies rather, however, in the fact that these tablets present no regular arrangements, as to class, date, or authorship; and this is still further complicated by the fact that many of the tablets are rather to be regarded as scattered pages of lost works than complete works in themselves.

Fragmentary, varied in date and character, as most of these tablets are, the patient study and research of such able scholars as the late M. François Lenormant in France, and the Rev. Professor A. H. Sayce in England, have done much to introduce system and order where chaos formerly existed; and to enable us to ascertain, with some degree of approximation, the oldest of the religious books of Chaldea. Among these tablets are a large number whose religious teaching centres round the ancient city of Eridu. This ancient city, the older name of which was *Eri-dugga* ("the Holy City"), was the Jerusalem, the Umritza, the Mecca, of Chaldea. Situated on the shores of the Persian Gulf, which at that remote period came much farther inland¹ than at the present day, it was the sacred city of Ea, the all-wise god of the sea. Ea was the god, not only of the material watery sea, but also of the mystic deep,² the *Oceanos*, which surrounded the earth like a serpent, and which was his symbol.

Here then grew up the creed of the worship of the sea-god. They heard his voice in the murmur of the waves, and in the ebbing and flowing tide.³ They saw his anger in the stormy waves, which lashed themselves with fury, and made the sea wild with tossing billows. In the deep depths of its coral caves he dwelt—invisible to men, yet knowing all things.

It is difficult to trace the origin of this cult; it is, perhaps, to be attributed to a tribe who entered Chaldea from the sea, or who, at any rate, were a race of navigators, as shown by the epithets of their god: "lord of the boatment," "lord of ships," "lord of sea and rivers," all of which are those of a seafaring people. We have certainly a trace of this early school of religious teaching preserved in the legend of Oannes, recorded by Berossus. This strange fish-man rose day by day from the waters of the Erythrean Sea, to teach men the first elements of civilization. In this tradition the epithets found on the tablets: "the wise one," "the intelligent," "the one who knows all things," are evidently embraced in the character of the instructor applied to Oannes. In these older tablets, partially magical, we find the devotee in his trouble turning to Ea to aid him to remove his sickness or drive away a malevolent foe; but the holy one, while being the supreme god and father of all, holds no direct communication with men. They hear his voice in the waves, they feel his presence and his breath in the cool breeze at eventide. "In the innermost recesses we have smelt his pure breath," says one of the hymns. Thus he made himself manifest like Yaveh to Adam in the garden, in the cool of the evening; but they saw him not. A mediator was found!! Day by day, as they looked to-

¹ The site of Eridu is now marked by the mounds of Abu Shahrein on the east bank of the Euphrates, about twenty miles south of Mughin, or Ur. Calculating the growth of alluvial at a similar proportion to that of the present day, about six feet per annum, it must have been earlier than B.C. 3000, considerably, when Eridu was an open port on the shores of the gulf.

² This region was called Absu or Apsu, the Apason of Damascius, and is explained by *Bit nemehi*, "the house of deep knowledge."

³ W. A. I., ii. 18-30-35.

ward the eastern horizon bounding the sea, they saw a bright being rise from the sea. Each day he rose from it, bringing with him light and brightness, and driving away the dread darkness, and all day long he remained with men, casting over them his all-seeing eye; when once again at even he sank to rest in his western home on the border of the far-distant sea. Surely this bright being must be a child of the sea-god. Each day he left his father's house and came forth in his character of "protector of good men" (*Silik-mulu-dugga*), and each night he returned to his father's house in the mysterious region of the *Absu*, "the house of deep knowledge." "Surely," they said, "he must be our messenger to the all-wise divine father." Thus, through all these older hymns, we find the teaching of the worship of Ea and his communion with men by the mediation of his son, *Mardugga*, "the holy son," which was afterwards corrupted into Marduk or Merodach. The epithets applied to Merodach in these hymns, dating from the third millennium before the Christian era, are very remarkable, and show a high development of anthropomorphism; "Merodach, substance of myself;" "Merodach, firstborn of the deep (*apsi*), thou canst make pure and prosperous;" "Merodach, the son of Eridu." It was Merodach who bore to his father the plaint of the sick and sinful: "To his father he approached, his message he repeated, 'O my father, the disease of the head is fallen upon the man.'" It is from his father that he receives the instruction to heal: "O my son, what dost thou not know? What shall I tell to thee more? What I know thou knowest. Go, my son Merodach, take the man to the house of purification, and remove his ban and expel his curse."

The "protector of good men" (*Silik-mulu-dugga*) became himself the god of good men, the god of goodness, the *good god*.

Here, then, the element of dualism was introduced, and its appearance in Chaldean mythology is most interesting and extremely valuable to students of the religious developments of surrounding nations.

Darkness and night were to the early myth-maker the representatives of evil. It was at night that the demons, the vampires, and ghoulish foes of man came forth to war against him. The demon of chaos, the *bis-bis tiamat*, or dragon of the sea, was the queen of primæval night, and the ruler of the powers of evil. Between the powers of evil and darkness, and Merodach, the holy son, the offspring of his all-wise father Ea, the *good god*, there was a never-ceasing war—a dread struggle waged morn after morn and eve after eve.

Each morning the bright one rose from his home, the dark serpent of night, the serpent with seven heads and seven tails, the hebdominal serpent, coiled round the earth holding it in bondage. Through the darkness darts the "first ray of light," the arrow of the god, like the arrow of Apollo or the spear of Michael. The serpent is wounded, the wound grows wider and wider, the edges are tinged with golden red, the blood of the dragon, who slowly uncoils. Through the broken coil comes the

conquering bright Sun-god, clad in glistening armour, and armed with all the panoply of war. His curved sword or sabre, his mace, his sacred bow made of the wood of the tree of the gods, and his quiver full of death-dealing arrows. Like Mithra, Michael, or Apollo, he comes forth as the warrior of the gods to crush the evil one.

The serpent, defeated, sinks slowly away, and her allies, the black storm-clouds, lie in heaps on the horizon like flies. The victor, "crushes the brain of the serpent with his mace." The head of the serpent is bruised, and victory rests with goodness and right.

Eventide draws near, the victor of the morn has made his triumphal progress o'er the azure field of heaven, and now sinks to his home in the west, where the gates of the setting sun guarded by the Scorpion Kerubim open to receive him. Scarce has he reached the threshold, when there creeps slowly on his heel the reborn serpent of night; and the victor, like Achilles, is wounded in his vulnerable part. Thus, day by day, the prophecy in Genesis finds its repetition in nature. The head of the serpent is crushed and bruised, yet night by night he comes upon the path of the victor to bruise his heel.

Thus we find in the old mythology of Chaldea, as in those of the Aryan and Semite, the myth of the daily recurring war between light and darkness, between good and evil, with its beautiful native poesy. It is the teaching of this school of Eridu, "the holy city," with its almost monotheistic worship of Ea and his divine son, that exercised a most powerful influence on the future developments of the national religious life.

In tracing the growth and development of religious belief in Babylonia, we must remember that religious progress synchronizes with social progress. The weird creeds, animism, fetish worship, etc., with their liturgies of magic, belong to the family and early tribal stages. With the settlement in cities came the rise of the city god, the temple and the local school of theology. Ur became the centre of the worship of the moon-god. Erech became the centre of the cultus of Nana, Larsa and Sippara, the Northern and Southern Heliopoli; and Kutha or Tigabba "the city of the bowing down of the head," the great centre of eschatological¹ teaching, and the worship of Nergal, the "great devourer," the god of death. One of the most ancient religious centres was that of Sergul, the city of the fire-god, contemporary with Eridu.

The local centres of religious life in Chaldea were most important features in the intellectual progress of the people; for each became the seat of a school of prophets and teachers; and much of the learning and wisdom which in after time made Babylon the *Alma Mater* of Western Asia, was first elaborated in these local schools. There grew up, therefore, in Babylonia, as early as the twenty-fifth century before the Christian Era, a series of local educational centres. The local priests and doctors were most

¹ Relating to the doctrine of the last things

jealous of the teaching of their school, and the rights and privileges of their temple; and, like the Brahmins in India and the priests in Egypt, were by far the most influential caste in the land. The king often was by birth, and always by right of office, a *khattesi*, or "high priest," and as such head of the Church and State. It is these local centres, like the local polyarchies, that is one of the most characteristic features of Babylonian religious life, and which exercised a great power in its subsequent developments.

It would require more time than is at my disposal this afternoon to describe the nature and character of the teaching in these various temple colleges; two, however, deserve more than a mere passing notice. The first of these is the city of Ur, in which the Semites first make their appearance, a city of especial interest as being the birthplace and early home of Abram, the ancestor of the Hebrew people. The characteristic feature here was the worship of the Moon-god in his temple "of the great light," under the names of Aku, "the disk;" Nannar, "the bright one;" or Sin, "the bright." A name which is preserved in the names of Sinai and the wilderness of Sin.

The worship of the moon has always preceded that of the sun among nomad races; so here we see the Moon called the father of the Sun-god, and represented as an aged man with bright horns and a crystal beard.

Father, long-suffering and full of forgiveness, whose hand upholds the life of all mankind:

Lord, Thy divinity fills the far-distant heaven and the widespread sea with reverence.

On the surface of the peopled earth, he bids sanctuaries be placed, and proclaims for (each) its name.

Father, creator of gods and men, who causes the shrine to be founded, who establishes his offering.

In Heaven who is supreme? Thou alone art supreme!

In Earth who is supreme? Thou alone art supreme!

As for thee, thy will is made known in heaven, and the angels bow down their faces.

As for thee, thy will is made known in earth, and the spirits kiss the ground.

As for thee, thy will is spread on high as the wind, the stall and the fold bring forth.

As for thee, thy will is declared on earth, and the green herb grows.

As for thee, thy will is made known in the resting-place, and the sheep-cote, and all living things increase.

As for thee, thy will has created law and justice, in that man by it has made a law.

As for thee, thy will is the far-distant heaven and the innermost parts of the earth, no man has known it.

As for thee, who can explain thy will; what can rival it?

These hymns exhibit considerable advance on the cruder thoughts of the older Turanian magic songs and litanies; and it must, to a large degree, be attributed to the influence of a purer and more poetic thought inspired by the desert life of the Semitic people. It is curious in these hymns, dating back certainly to the twenty-fifth century before the Christian era, to find phrases and expressions almost similar to those used by the Hebrew psalmists. The discovery of these fragments of the liturgy of the temple of the "great light," in which the ancestors of Terakh and Abram worshipped, is a very important one, for the monuments now show that the

city of Kharran in North Mesopotamia, to which Abram emigrated, was a colony from Ur of the Chaldees, and its "temple of brightness" an adjunct of the mother-temple of Ur. Perhaps in these hymns and psalms we may trace the first inspirations of the songs of Zion.

The second centre of religious life to which I would call your attention is the dual city of Sippara, the Sepharvaim of the Old Testament (2 Kings xviii.), a city from which the Samaritan colonists were taken. It was one of the oldest cities of the Chaldean Empire, being by Berossus attributed to antediluvian ages—the city in which Xisuthrus, the Chaldean Noah, placed the records of pre-diluvian history. The explorations upon the site now marked by the mounds of Abbu Hubba prove it to be a city whose temple, dedicated to the sun-god, had grown old and decayed, at as remote a period as B.C. 3800, and some archaic inscriptions from the site may be ascribed to an even more remote antiquity. Here there grew up a most powerful temple, with its schools, libraries, observatories; and supporting a vast number of priests, doctors, and scribes. The cultus located here was that of the worship of the bright sun-god under his name of Bar-har, or Samas; and the legends and myths of his wars and loves are most poetic, and valuable to the student of comparative mythology. According to the fragments which have been recovered from the library of this temple, the hymns are full of the most beautiful poetry. The sun, in a morning hymn, is described as opening the great gates of the rising sun and coming forth upon the world "like a wife pleased and giving pleasure," an expression which finds its equivalent in the Hebrew Psalms (xix. 5 *et seq.*): "The Sun which as a bridegroom cometh out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course." Spreading bright light, he looks upon all nations, and all nations turn their face to him; "his name is in all mouths;" "thou art a banner," a rallying-point, "to all the wide earth." In another hymn we read of the beautiful, all-seeing eyes of the sun, "the judge of men." His strength, like that of Samson, is in his bright golden locks and beard, which represent his rays of light, shorn and marred by the cold, cutting winter. He dies to rise again in all his youthful beauty. In the temple were his sacred chariot and horses, such as those of the Greek Apollo or the Syrian sun-god, which were destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 11). These are two of the chief centres of religious life which were in contact with the Hebrew people in pre-captivity times, and are therefore of more interest to us than some of the others, of which time does not permit me to speak.

In tracing the growth and development of religious life in Babylonia, we must always maintain a synchronism with the social progress of the people; and thus we shall be able to establish a regular sequence in the progressive stages.

The age of polyarchy and the varied local schools of religious thought, was terminated by the period when the various city kingdoms became amalgamated into one, and the empire was consolidated under the govern-

ment of one powerful ruler. Such partial consolidations had taken place at various times, as, for example, in B.C. 3800, when Sargon I., of Agade or Akkad, became ruler of the land, or later, about B.C. 2500, when the kings of Ur, Urbahu and Dungi, had founded a united empire in South Babylonia.

But the grand and final consolidation took place about B.C. 2200, when a powerful prince, Kammurabi, proclaimed himself king of Sumir and Akkad, namely North and South Babylonia, and assumed the epithet of "builder of the land," namely, founder of the empire, and made Babylon his capital. Babylon had before this been but a second-rate city. It is true that dynasties from Dintir-Ki, or Babylon, had from time to time held sway; but it was not until this period that Babylon became the religious and secular capital of the empire. Its central position, its accessibility from all parts, made it an excellent site for the national capital; and, once established as such, it remained so for more than two thousand years.

With the establishment of Babylon as the national capital came the elevation of the local god of Babylon into the position of the national god.

A similar change followed the conversion of the old Canaanite fortress of Jebus into the Hebrew capital of Jerusalem. By the removal of the Ark, the Hebrew *palladium*, to the new capital, it formed a species of compact between Yaveh and the royal house; and Yaveh of Jerusalem became the national god. This change was only gradual, taking, as M. Renan remarks, nearly four centuries to reach its full development. In this centralization of religious as well as secular authority in one common centre lies the great secret of Babylonian national prosperity; and as long as the alliance was maintained the power of the empire was unbreakable.

The local god of Babylon was Marduk, or Merodach; but on his elevation to the position of national god he assumed many of the attributes of his father Ea, and also of Bel, "the lord of the world," and became known as Bel-Merodach, the Belus of the Greek writers. Khammurabi restored and beautified his great temple called by the name of E-Sagilla, "the house of the lofty head;" and every monarch from this period until the days of Cyrus added his quota to its adornment and wealth. It became the metropolitan cathedral of Babylonia, the centre of all religious life throughout the vast empire. The dynasty of Khammurabi lasted over two centuries, and thus the work begun by the founder was cemented and made firm; and although there were numerous temples of far greater antiquity and of more impressive religious associations, yet for all time this edifice became the national temple of Babylonia, and one of the wonders of the world.

It was, however, during the important period of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, founded by Nabupalassar, in B.C. 625, and his successors, that this great national religion was at the zenith of its glory.

This is the period upon which we are now getting a flood of light by the

recent discoveries in Babylonia; is one of the most important in the history of religious development in Western Asia; and one which throws an extremely important light upon the post-captivity aspect of Judaism. For it is during this period, from B.C. 586 to B.C. 538, that the Jewish people were in the closest contact and relationship with their captors—a contact almost amounting to an absorption by their captors. Merodach now occupied almost the same position in regard to the affairs of Babylonia that Yaveh occupies in the writings of the later Jewish prophets. He is the national god. Babylonia is “spoken of as his chosen field or land”—Babylon as his chosen city which he loves, while Bit Saggil is the abode which he loves. The enemies of the nation are his enemies. This is notably shown in the case of the overthrow of the Medes. Prior to B.C. 549, the Medes, growing in power, had been a serious danger threatening the empire—as enemies of the empire they are also enemies of the national god. Thus, in the inscription: “Merodach, the great lord, caused Cyrus, his little servant, to go up against Astyages, the king of the Barbarians; he overthrew him, his city Ecbatana he captured, and his spoil he carried away;” Cyrus is here spoken of as the little servant of the national god, because he is doing his work. Nabonidus himself is the greater servant. Here, then, Merodach occupies exactly the same position that is assigned to Cyrus by Yaveh in Isaiah xlv. 28, xlv. 1, where he is spoken of as “Cyrus, my prince.” Kings and princes do his work in destroying these foes, and he applies to these enemies the same epithet as the Hebrew god, “the unrighteous (*la magari*), who shall be utterly swept off the face of the earth.” He is a jealous god, and, as such, brooks no interference with his sovereignty. This is shown in the progress of events which led to the fall of the Babylonian Empire. Nabonidus, the last of the native Babylonian kings, who ascended the throne in B.C. 555, was a vacillating ruler, caring rather for pleasure, and especially apparently for antiquarian researches, than for the duties of State. In the valuable chronicle tablet we read the often-repeated phrase: “Bel came not forth;” denoting that the annual processions of the gods were not celebrated. In addition to this neglect of the worship of Merodach, the king, actuated perhaps by his antiquarian zeal, gathered together in the temple of Bel the statues of all the gods from the various great temples of the land. This, naturally, had a most serious effect on the priest caste. The priests of Bel-Merodach were offended, and *ergo* the god himself also, at being brought in contact with these local divinities; and the priests of the various local temples, many of them older than Babylon itself, were naturally incensed against the king, who deprived them of their local *palladia*. The action of the king naturally produced a religious revolution in the land, and a powerful opposition to the king.

The sole controlling element in the land was found in Belshazzar, the king's son, who seems to have been most punctilious in his religious duties, as well as an active and able soldier. But the gods, as represented

by the priests, were against him, and his fate was certain. The Babylonians, like the Jews, were at this time looking to the same source for deliverance. Cyrus, the Persian, was hailed alike by Jew and Babylonian as the one who would restore the capital—and restore the national temple, and restore the national religion—and bring peace to each alike. There was a very rich and powerful Jewish element in the population, and it is very probable that they took the popular side in this national crisis. The great banking firm, who lent money to kings and princes, and farmed the Babylonian revenues of both temples and State are now admitted, by almost all Assyriologists, to be of Jewish origin. Their name, Egibi, or Ikibi, is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew Yakob, or Jacob. One strong argument that these people sided with the Babylonians in welcoming Cyrus as the deliverer, is shown in the fact that their commercial transactions, of which we possess thousands of documents, are only interrupted for a few days by the events of the fall of Babylon. It is not, therefore, to be wondered, with these elements in his favour, that Cyrus entered city after city, and lastly Babylon itself, without fighting. It was on the evening of the 15th of the month Tammuz, the great festival of the marriage of Ishtar and Tammuz Adonis, in the year B.C. 538, that Babylon fell, Belshazzar was slain, and the empire fell.

“That night they slew him on his father's throne,
The deed unnoticed, and the hand unknown,
Crownless and sceptreless Belshazzar lay,
A robe of purple round a form of clay.”

Cyrus was hailed as a deliverer, a messiah. He freed the Babylonians from the eccentricity of an unpopular man, and afforded to the Jews the prospect of a deliverance. He is hailed by the national god as his servant, his viceroy; and the inscriptions from the temple of Merodach clearly reveal this. Thus is the Persian ruler spoken of: “Merodach, the great lord, restorer of his people, beheld with joy the deeds of his vice-regent, who was righteous in hand and heart. To his city of Babylon he summoned his march; like a friend and a comrade he went by his side; without fighting or battle he caused him to enter his city of Babylon. The lord god, who in his mercy raises the dead to life, and who benefits all men in difficulty and prayer, has in favour drawn to him and made mighty his name. Merodach, the great lord, freed the heart of his servant, whom the people of Babylon obey.” These passages are sufficient to show Cyrus was welcomed by the Babylonians, and the short time in which he assumed and established here in his new empire proves the willingness of the people to submit to him. The policy of Cyrus in thus recognising the religion of Babylon, and becoming a prayerful servant of Nebo and Merodach, would seem to directly contradict the statements of the Hebrew prophet Isaiah (ch. xlv. 1), where he is attributed with the most iconoclastic tenets, but it is only in perfect accordance with the subsequent action of Cambyses and

Darius in Egypt, where the former conformed to the worship of Neit, and the latter to the adoration of Animon, to whom he built a temple in the oasis of El Kargeh.

It was remarked by the late Emanuel Deutsch how remarkable was the change wrought in the Hebrew people during the period of the captivity. They entered the land a people ever falling into idolatry, and falling from the service of the national god. In no way were they centralized, either in national or religious life, with no great national ambition, with only a law applicable to desert life, and no code suitable to civic life. Yet in the short period of about sixty years they return from their captivity a new people.

We can see, perhaps, some of the forces which produced this in the perfectly systematized social and religious codes of Babylonia with which they came so intimately associated. The national temple was the centre of all religious life, as the second temple became to the Jews. The great temple was fed by the local temples, which existed in all towns and villages, and which corresponded to that important post-captivity institution, the Synagogue. The Babylonian festivals corresponded to the Hebrew great festivals almost day for day. In Nisan the feast of the spring or opening, which varied from the first to the eighth or fifteenth of Nisan according to the period of the equinox, corresponded to the Passover. In Tisri there came the harvest feast, the feast of tabernacles; while the strange festival of darkness and weeping on the fifteenth of Adar, which preceded "the great day when the destinies of all men were forecast," bears a strange resemblance to the Jewish feast of Purim. The temple of the Babylonians was essentially the same in name and construction and arrangement as that of the Jews. The Hekal, the "holy place," literally the "palace," was separated as in the Jewish temple from the holy of holies, by a veil. This latter was called by the name of *parakku*, the "shut-off portion," a word cognate with the Hebrew *paroketh*, "the veil." Within it were the most precious records of the people or city, similar to the Jewish ark, placed in stone cists, as in the temples at Ballawat and Sippara. Immediately above them was the throne of the god, covered by a species of *baldachino*, corresponding to the mercy-seat, and supported by Kerubim, or composite figures. Most of their institutions which distinguished them from the Gentile (*goim*) nations are to be found in Babylonia. The Sabbath, called by the Babylonians the white day, "or the day of the rest of the heart," was kept on the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days with a strictness as great as that of the most Pharisaic Jews. No food was to be cooked, no fire to be lit, the clothes of the body might not be changed, it was even unlawful to wash. The king might not ride in his chariot or exercise any act of judgment or royalty. Sacrifice must not be offered until after sunset, when the Sabbath was over. One remarkable restriction was, that no medicine should be taken. "Medicine for the sickness of his body he shall not apply," which, no doubt, gave rise

to the Pharisaic question to Jesus, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day?" In addition to this, even that distinctive ceremony which the Jews regarded as characteristic of their people, the rite of circumcision, we now know was a Chaldean custom long before Abram left his Chaldean home. With these remarkable resemblances it is not astonishing that in so short a time the Samaritan colonists from Babylonia became assimilated to Judaism. The laws which had been sufficient for the Hebrew people in the early nomadic stages of their life, in the first settlement in Palestine under the patriarchs and their wanderings in the desert, was totally inadequate for the new life of the city and town dweller. We now find the captivity producing that wonderful compendium of laws, entering into the minutest details of civic, domestic, and social life, the Talmud; and when we examine these laws, it is perfectly apparent that the whole is based upon the precedents of Babylonian laws.

The captivity was truly the *renaissance* of the Jewish people. Broken into divers factions, disintegrated in all their national affinities; with no common bond, no common aim, with a half-developed religion confined almost exclusively to the school of Jerusalem prophets. We find them returning from a short captivity of less than seventy years, a changed and new people. Zealous of the worship of the national god—impregnated with a national love and spirit, so deeply ingrained into their nature that the severest persecutions to which any body of people has been subjected have failed to eradicate it from the hearts of even the poorest and the weakest. Entering Babylon with an incomplete law, they emerge with a religious and secular code perfect in all its branches. With these facts before us we cannot too highly estimate the influence of Babylonia as a centre of religious development and influence.

In my lecture this afternoon, I have been able to deal with only one section in the vast mass of Babylonian literature—but certainly, I believe the most important section. The material is ample, the work has been the result of the labour of a few patient students; but the time will come—is rapidly drawing near, when no student of the science of religion will feel his work complete without a careful study of these ancient tomes, which for centuries have lain hidden in the treasure-houses of antiquity. From them we learn that not only was Babylon the motherland of culture and civilization, of arts, science, and letters, but also that in her temple schools were taught the first principles of many of the great doctrines of religion which we hear at the present day set forth from our pulpits.

THE RELIGION OF THE ASSYRIANS.

BY CANON GEORGE RAWLINSON.

OF all the nations of remote antiquity—of those, I mean, which flourished before the rise of the Greeks and Romans into a conspicuous place—there is none which occupies a higher position, or more deserves to have a share in our thoughts and attention, than the nation of the Assyrians. “The Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon,” says the prophet Ezekiel, “fair of branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs . . . nor was any tree in the garden of God like unto him in his beauty” (Ezek xxxi. 3, 8). The Assyrian Empire, if we regard it as continued in the later Babylonian, lasted eight hundred years, and extended, at its acme, from the Persian Desert to the Ægean Sea and the Sahara. It included in it Persia, Media, Susiana, Babylonia, Assyria Proper, Mesopotamia, Armenia, great part of Asia Minor, Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, Idumæa, and Egypt. It was the first example of a really *great* empire. It consolidated all Western Asia under a single head. It broke the power of the Egyptians. It made great advances in the arts. At a time when Europe was sunk in barbarism it had reached a degree of civilization far from contemptible—in most points equal, in many superior, to the boasted civilization of Egypt.

Besides the general interest attaching to Assyria from its power and position among the nations of the ancient world, a special interest must always attach to it in a Christian land from the part which it played in the history of the “chosen people”—of that “Israel of God” whereof the Christian community is the continuation and the representative. Assyria was the fated instrument in God’s hand for the destruction, first of the kingdom of Samaria, and then of the kingdom of Judæa, and so for the elevation and purification of later Judaism by the “sweet uses of adversity.” The names of Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, must always remain “household words” in every land in which the Bible is read; and among Bible readers of any intelligence, as well as among students of history generally, there must always be a desire to know what manner of men they were whom those great chieftains led from the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris to those of the Jordan and the Nile, to Damascus, Samaria, Jerusalem, Memphis.

The most important element in the thought of a people, the chief influence by which their character is formed, and their inner and even their outer life determined, is their religion. If we would possess more than a superficial knowledge of the real history of nations, we must study

carefully—not only the records of their external deeds, and the monuments that they have left behind them, but—principally and above all else—their religions.

With these few preliminary remarks on the importance of the subject assigned to me in this Course of Lectures, I shall proceed to grapple with the task allotted me, and endeavour to set before you, as simply and plainly as I can, the true nature of the Assyrian Religion—or, at any rate, its leading characteristics.

First, then, the Assyrian religion was a polytheism—a system in which the unity of the Godhead was broken up into fragments, and a large number of deities were presented as objects of adoration to the worshipper, each being regarded as distinct from all the rest, each having his own form, his own attributes, his own emblems, his own temples. So far as appears, there was no esoteric religion, or secret teaching, by which the gods were identified one with another, and explained to be mere aspects of a single deity. This was the case in Egypt, but not, so far as I can see, in Assyria or Babylonia. There each god was a really distinct personage. The gods, like men, formed a community, in which councils were held, disputes took place, quarrels even might break out, one god might injure or oppress another; each acted as he pleased, according to his “own sweet will,” and wills might conflict; and so there might even be “war in heaven,” as indeed there was upon one occasion, of which I shall speak at more length further on.

Secondly, there was not even among the gods a single acknowledged chief ruler. There were certain gradations of rank, generally, though not always, observed; but no authority was exercised; many gods are called “chief of the gods,” “king of the gods,” even “god of the gods.” Each seems to be supreme in his own sphere. Any one of many may be taken by a worshipper as *his* peculiar god, and worshipped almost exclusively of the others. There is no *μοναρχία*—rather what the Greeks would have called *ἀναρχία*—“an absence of government.”

Thirdly, the polytheism is not very multitudinous. We hear, indeed, in certain passages, of the “4,000” and even of the “5,000 gods;” but, practically, only some twenty distinct deities obtain frequent mention in the inscriptions. There are, indeed, a number of local divinities, river gods, country gods, town gods, and village gods—but these are suspected to be in many cases the great gods of the Pantheon, disguised under rustic appellations, while in other cases they are obscure and insignificant personages, known to few, and scarcely worshipped by any. It is not my intention to call your attention to these minor deities, but rather to ask you to concentrate your thoughts for the present on the nineteen or twenty “great gods” of the Assyrian and Babylonian Pantheon.

At the head of the Pantheon in either country stood a god, not the origin of the others, not in any real sense the fountain of divinity, but of higher rank and dignity than the rest—“the first among equals”—ordi-

narly named first, and assigned the titles of greatest honour, forming thus the principal, or at least the highest object of worship, both to the kings and to the people. This deity is, in Assyria, Asshur; in Babylonia, Il (or Ra). Some critics are of opinion that the two great gods are essentially one, the Assyrian Asshur being neither more nor less than Il (or Ra) localized, and regarded as the special god of Assyria, the protector of the Assyrian territory, and the tutelary divinity of the Assyrian kings. But this view is not generally accepted, and seems to rest upon no sure foundations. There is a marked difference of character between the Babylonian Il and the Assyrian Asshur. Il, in the Babylonian system, is dim and shadowy; his attributes are, comparatively speaking, indistinct; and his very name is not of frequent occurrence. Asshur, in the Assyrian system, is, of all of the gods, by far the most pronounced and prominent figure. No name occurs so often as his; no god has attributes so clearly marked and positive. On these grounds it has been generally held that the two are not to be identified, but to be kept distinct, and to be regarded as respectively peculiar to the two countries. I shall, therefore, speak of them separately.

Il (or Ra) was, as I have already said, a somewhat shadowy being. There is a vagueness about the very name, which simply means "god," and cannot be said to express any particular attribute. His form is never represented on the monuments; and his name is omitted from many lists, as if he were too holy to be spoken of. He does not appear to have had any special temples; and his name is rarely made an element in the personal appellations of individuals. He must, however, have been originally the tutelary deity of Babylon, which was named after him—Bab-il, or "the gate of Il."

Asshur, the Assyrian substitute for Il, was primarily and especially the tutelary deity of Assyria, and of the Assyrian monarchs. The land of Assyria bears his name without any modification; its inhabitants are "his servants," or "his people;" its troops, "the armies of the God Asshur;" its enemies, "the enemies of Asshur." The kings stand connected with him in respect of almost everything which they do. He places them upon the throne, firmly establishes them in the government, lengthens the years of their reigns, preserves their power, protects their forts and armies, directs their expeditions, gives them victory in the day of battle, makes their name celebrated, multiplies their offspring greatly, and the like. To him they look for the fulfilment of all their wishes, and especially for the establishment of their sons, and their sons' sons, on the Assyrian throne to the remotest ages. Their usual phrase, when speaking of him, is "Asshur, *my* Lord." They represent themselves as passing their lives in his service. It is to spread his worship that they carry on their wars. They fight, ravage, and destroy in his name. Finally, when they subdue a country, they are careful to "set up the emblems of Asshur," and to make the people conform to his laws.

The ordinary titles of Asshur are: "The great lord," "the king of all the gods," "he who rules supreme over the gods." He is also called occasionally "the father of the gods," although that is a title which belongs more properly to another deity. He is figured as a man with a horned cap and often carrying a bow—issuing from the middle of a winged circle, and either shooting an arrow from the bow, or stretching forth his hand, as if to aid or smite. The winged circle by itself is also used as his emblem, and probably denotes his ubiquity and eternity, as the human form does his intelligence, and the horned cap his power. This emblem—the winged circle—either with or without the human figure, is an almost invariable accompaniment of Assyrian royalty. The "great king" wears it embroidered upon his robes, carries it engraved upon his seal or cylinder, represents it above his head in the rock tablets whereon he carves his image, kneels or stands in adoration before it, fights under its shadow, under its protection returns victorious, places it conspicuously upon his obelisks and other monuments; and, in all these representations, it is remarkable how, by slight modifications, he makes the emblem conform to the circumstances of his own employment at the time. When he is fighting, Asshur, too, has his arrow upon the string, and points it against the monarch's adversaries. When he is returning home victorious with the disused bow in his left hand, and his right hand outstretched and elevated, Asshur has the same attitude. In peaceful scenes the bow disappears altogether. If the king worships, the god holds out his hand to aid; if he is engaged in secular acts, the divine presence is thought to be sufficiently marked by the circle and the wings without the human figure.

In immediate succession to Asshur in Assyria, and Il (or Ra) in Babylonia, we find in both countries a Triad, consisting of Anu, Bel, and Hea (or Hoa). These three are called in some places specially and distinctively "the great gods." In execrations, where curses are invoked on those who shall do certain acts, they are separated off from all the other deities, and placed together in a clause, which stands at the head of the entire list of anathemas. In invocations their names follow, for the most part, immediately after the name of Asshur; and this is their usual and proper place in all complete lists of the chief gods. Anu and Bel in the Babylonian system are brothers, both of them being sons of Il (or Ra); but this relationship is scarcely acknowledged in Assyria. Hea, in both countries, stands apart, unconnected with the other two, but still their equal, and joined with them in a Triad, wherein he occupies the third place.

It has been conjectured by M. François Lenormant, that in this triad we have a cosmogonic myth, and that the three deities which form it represent—Anu, the primordial chaos, or matter without form; Hea, life and intelligence, considered as moving in and animating matter; and Bel, the organizing and creating spirit, by which matter was actually brought into subjection, and the material universe evoked out of chaos

and settled in an orderly way. But it may be questioned whether the veil which hides the inner meaning of the Assyrian religion, if it had an inner meaning, is as yet sufficiently lifted to entitle mere conjectures on its true import to much attention. For my own part, I believe that Anu, Bel, and Hea were originally the gods respectively of the earth, of the heavens, and of the waters, thus corresponding in the main to the well-known Pluto, Zeus or Jupiter, and Poseidon or Neptune, of the Greeks and Romans, who divided between them the dominion over the visible creation. But this early belief became, in course of time, overlaid to a great extent with other notions; and though Hea continued always to have, more or less, the character of a water deity, Anu and Bel ceased to have peculiar spheres, and became merely "great gods," with a general superintendence over the world, and with no very marked difference of powers.

Anu is commonly spoken of as "the old Anu," "the original chief," "the king of the lower world," and "the lord of spirits and demons." There is one text in which he seems to be called "the father of the gods;" but the reading is doubtful. We cannot identify as his any one of the divine forms which appear on the Assyrian or Babylonian cylinders or other monuments; nor can we assign to him any distinct emblem, unless it be that of the single upright wedge, which represents him on the Chaldean numeration tablets. This single upright wedge has the numerical power of "sixty;" and sixty appears to have been assigned to Anu as his special number. Though a "great god," he was not one towards whom much preference was shown. His name is scarcely ever found as an element in royal or other appellations; the kings do not very often mention it, and only one monarch—the first Tiglath-pileser (about B.C. 1130)—speaks of himself as Anu's special votary.

The second god of the first Triad—the god Bel—familiarily known to us by the mentions of him which occur in the canonical Scriptures and in the Apocrypha, is one of the most marked and striking figures in the Pantheon alike of Babylonia and of Assyria. Bel is "the god of lords," "the father of the gods," "the creator," "the mighty prince," and "the just prince of the gods." He plays a leading part in the mythological legends, which form so curious a feature in the Babylonian and Assyrian religion. In the *History of Creation* we are told that Bel made the earth and the heaven; that he formed man by a mixture of his own blood with earth, and also formed beasts, and that afterwards he created the sun and the moon, and the five planets. In the *War of the Gods* we find him contending with the great dragon, Tiamat, and after a terrible single combat destroying her by flinging a thunderbolt into her open mouth. He also, in conjunction with Hea, plans the defence when the seven spirits of evil rise in rebellion, and the dwelling-place of the gods is assaulted by them. The titles of Bel generally express dominion. He is "the Lord" *par excellence*, which is the exact meaning of his name in

Assyrian; he is "the king of all the spirits," "the lord of the world," and again "the lord of all the countries." Babylon and Nineveh are both of them under his special care, Nineveh having the title of "the city of Bel" in some passages of the inscriptions. His chief temples were at Babylon, at Nipur, at Calah (now Nimrud), and at Duraba (now Akkerkuf).

Hea (or Hoa), the third god of the first Triad, ranks immediately after Bel in the complete lists of Assyrian deities. He is emphatically one of the "great gods," and is called "the king," "the great inventor," and "the determiner of destinies." I have already remarked that he is especially connected with the element of water, and hence he is "the king of the deep," "the king of rivers," "the lord of fountains," and to a certain extent "the lord of the harvest." In the legend of Creation he is joined with Bel in the office of guardian, and watches over the regularity of the planetary courses. In the *War of the Gods* he and Bel plan the defence after which Hea commits the execution of the plans made to his son, Merodach. In the Flood legend Hea naturally plays an important part, since water is his element. It is he who announces to Hasis-adra, the Babylonian Noah, that a deluge is about to destroy mankind, and commands him to build a great ship, in order that he may escape it. It is he again who opposes the wish of Bel to make the destruction complete, and persuades him to let Hasis-adra and his family come out safe from the ark. In the tale of Ishtar's descent into Hades, Hea's counsel is sought by the moon-god; and by a skilful device he obtains the restoration of the queen of love to the upper world. Indeed, throughout the whole of the mythology we find all clever inventions and well-laid plans ascribed to him, so that his history quite justifies his title of "lord of deep thoughts." Hea is probably intended by the Oë of Helladius, and the Oannes of Berosus, who came up out of the Persian Gulf, and instructed the first settlers on the Lower Tigris and Euphrates in letters, science, religion, law, and agriculture.

In direct succession to the three gods of the first Triad—Anu, Bel, and Hea (or Hoa), we find a second still more widely recognised Triad, comprising the moon-god, the sun-god, and the god of the atmosphere. There is much difference of opinion with respect to the name of the last god of these three, which is never spelt phonetically, but only represented by a monogram. He has been called Iva (or Yav), Vul, Bin, Yem (or Im), and recently Rimmon. It does not much signify which of these names is preferred, as all rest upon conjecture; but, since convenience requires that he should be spoken of by a single definite appellation, I shall adopt that of "Vul," which was originally given to him by my brother. The second Triad then is one consisting of Sin, Shamas, and Vul, the gods respectively of the moon, the sun, and the atmosphere.

It is very noticeable that in Assyria and Babylonia the moon-god took precedence of the sun-god. Night was probably more agreeable to the

inhabitants of those hot regions than day; and the cool, placid time when they could freely contemplate the heavens, and make their stellar and other observations, was especially grateful to the priestly astronomers, who had the superintendence and arrangement of the religion. Sin, the moon—the first element in the name Sinakhirib (Sennacherib),—is thus one of the leading deities. He is called “the chief of the gods of heaven and earth,” “the king of the gods,” and even “the god of the gods.” These seem, however, to be honorific expressions, used by his votaries in the warmth of their hearts, with some touch of Oriental hyperbole. Sin was more properly “the illuminator,” “he who dwells in the sacred heavens,” “he who circles round the heavens,” and “the lord of the month.” Further, for some recondite reason which is not explained, he was selected to preside over architecture; and, in this connection, he is “the supporting architect,” “the strengthener of fortifications,” and “the lord of building.” A close bond of sympathy united Sin with the two other members of the second Triad. When the seven spirits of evil made war in heaven, and directed their main attack upon Sin, as the chief leader of the angelic host, Shamas and Vul instantly came to his aid, withstood the evil spirits, and, fighting firmly side by side with Sin, succeeded in repulsing them. The three gods are frequently conjoined in invocations, anathemas, and the like. In offerings and festivals, however, Sin is united with Shamas only, the place of Vul being taken by a goddess who is entitled “the divine mistress of the world.”

Sin was among the gods most widely and devoutly worshipped, both in Babylonia and Assyria. He had temples at Ur, Borsippa, Babylon, Calah, and Dur Sargina. The third month of the year, called Sivan, was dedicated to him. In another month not so dedicated, we find sacrifice to him prescribed on nine days of the thirty. His name was widely used as an element in royal and other appellations, as in Sennacherib, Sin-iddina, Sin-gasit, Naram-Sin, Sin-taggil, Sin-shar-uzur, and the like. A crescent moon is the ordinary emblem of Sin; but sometimes he is represented in a human form, with a long robe about him and a triple crown upon his head, the crown being surmounted by a crescent.

Shamas, the sun-god, occupies the middle position in the second Triad, which is either “Vul, Shamas, Sin,” or “Sin, Shamas, Vul,” but more commonly the latter. His titles are either general or special. In a general way he is called “the establisher of heaven and earth,” “the judge of heaven and earth,” “the warrior of the world,” and “the regent of all things”; while, with direct reference to his physical nature, he is “the lord of fire,” “the light of the gods,” “the ruler of the day,” and “he who illumines the expanse of heaven and earth.” The Assyrian kings regard him as affording them especial help in war. He is “the supreme ruler, who casts a favourable eye on expeditions,” “the vanquisher of the king’s enemies,” “the breaker up of opposition.” He “casts his motive influence” over the monarchs, and “causes them to assemble their chariots and their warriors”; he “goes forth with their armies,” and enables them

to extend their dominions ; he chases their enemies before them, causes opposition to cease, and brings them back with victory to their own country. Besides this, in time of peace he helps them to sway the sceptre of power, and to rule over their subjects with authority. It seems that, from observing the manifest agency of the material sun in stimulating all the functions of nature, the Assyrians and Babylonians came to the conclusion that the sun-god exercised a similar influence over the minds of men, and was the great motive agent in human history.

The worship of Shamas was universal. The seventh month, Tisri, was dedicated to him, and, in the second, Elul—the intercalary month—he had, like the moon-god, nine festivals. His emblem appears upon almost all the religious cylinders ; and in almost all lists of the gods his name holds a high place. Sometimes he is a member of a Triad, composed of himself together with Sin and Asshur. In the mythological legends, however, he is not very frequently mentioned. We find him, indeed, defending the moon-god, in conjunction with Vul, when the seven spirits made their assault upon heaven ; and in the Deluge tablets we are told that it was he who actually made the Flood. But otherwise the Assyrian mythology is silent concerning him, offering in this respect a remarkable contrast to the Egyptian, where the sun is the principal figure.

Vul, the god of the atmosphere, who completes the second Triad, has, on the whole, a position quite equal to that held by Sin and Shamas, whom he even, occasionally, precedes in the lists. Some kings seem to place him on a par with Anu, or even with Asshur, recognising Anu and Vul, or Asshur and Vul, as especially “the great gods,” and as their own peculiar guardians. In a general way, Vul corresponds with the Indra of the early Hindoos, or the “Jupiter Tonans” of the Romans, being “the prince of the power of the air,” the lord of the whirlwind and tempest, and the wielder of the thunderbolt. His most common titles are, “the lord of the air,” “the minister of heaven and earth,” and “he who makes the tempest to rage.” He is regarded as the destroyer of crops, the rooter-up of trees, the scatterer of the harvest ; famine, scarcity, and even their consequence, pestilence, are ascribed to him. He is said to hold in his hands a “flaming sword,” with which he effects his ravages ; and this “flaming sword,” which probably represents lightning, seems to form his emblem on the tablets and cylinders, where it is figured as a double or triple bolt. But Vul has also a softer character. As the god of the atmosphere, he gives the rain ; and hence he is “the careful and beneficent chief,” “the giver of abundance,” and “the lord of fecundity.” In this capacity he is naturally chosen to preside over canals, the great fertilizers in Mesopotamia ; and thus we find among his titles “the lord of canals,” and “the establisher of works of irrigation.”

Next in succession to the eight gods already described, may be placed six goddesses, closely connected with six of them. It is a general rule of Oriental mythologies, that each male principle shall have a female counter-

part. From this rule, in the Babylonian and Assyrian mythology, the highest of the gods, Il and Asshur, are exempt; but otherwise almost all the principal deities are united in pairs, of whom one is male and the other female. Anu has a wife called Anat or Anata, who is a pale and shadowy personage, the mere faint reflection of her husband, whose name she receives, merely modified by a feminine termination. Bel or Bil has a wife, Bilat, known to the classical writers as Beltis or Mylitta—a term standing to Bil as Anat to Anu, but designating a far more substantial personage. Beltis is “the mother of the gods,” “the *great* goddess,” “the great lady,” “the queen of the lands,” and “the queen of fecundity.” She corresponds to the Cybelé of the Phrygians, the Rhea of the Greeks, and the “Magna Mater” or “Bona Dea” of the Romans. Occasionally she adds to this character the attributes of Bellona, and even of Diana, being spoken of as presiding over war and hunting. The wife of Hea has been called Dāv-kina, Nin-azu, and Nin-ki-gal. She is called “the queen of Hades,” and “the lady of the house of death.” She was the mistress of the realms below, while on earth she had the special office of watching and soothing the last hours of the dying. To the wife of Sin, no proper name is given; but she is frequently associated with her husband under the appellation of “the great lady.” The wife of Shamas is Gula or Anunit. She was, like Beltis, “a *great* goddess,” but had a less distinctive character, being little more than a female sun. Finally, Vul had a wife called Shala or Tala, whose common title is *sarrat*, “queen,” but who is a colourless and insignificant personage.

We now come to a group of five deities, who are connected together by the fact that they have, all of them, an unmistakably *astral* character. These are Nin or Ninip, Marduk or Merodach, Nergal, Ishtar, and Nebo, who correspond respectively to the planets Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury.

Nin (or Ninip), who presided over the most distant of the visible planets, Saturn, was more an object of worship in Assyria than in Babylonia. He has been called “the Assyrian Hercules;” and no doubt he in many respects resembles that hero of the classical nations. Among his titles are the following: “The lord of the brave,” “the warlike,” “the champion,” “the warrior who subdues foes,” “the reducer of the disobedient,” “the exterminator of rebels,” “the powerful lord,” “the exceeding strong god,” and “he whose sword is good.” He presides in a great measure both over war and hunting. Most of the Assyrian monarchs represent themselves as going out to war under his auspices, and ascribe their successes mainly to his interposition. He is especially useful to them in the subjection of rebels. He also upon some occasions incites them to engage in the chase, and aids them strenuously in their encounters with wild bulls and lions. It is thought that he was emblematically portrayed in the winged and human-headed bull which forms so striking a feature in the architectural erections of the Assyrians.

As Nin was a favourite Assyrian, so Merodach was a favourite Babylonian, god. From the earliest times the Babylonian monarchs placed him in the highest rank of deities, worshipping him in conjunction with Anu, Bel, and Hea, the three gods of the first Triad. The great temple of Babylon, known to the Greeks as the "Temple of Bel," was certainly dedicated to him; and it would therefore seem that the later Babylonians, at any rate, must have applied to him the name of Bel, or "lord," which in earlier times had designated a different member of their Pantheon. Merodach's ordinary titles are "the great," "the great lord," "the prince," "the prince of the gods," and "the august god." He is also called "the judge," "the most ancient," "he who judges the gods," "the eldest son of heaven," and, in one place, "the lord of battles." Occasionally he has still higher and seemingly exclusive designations, such as "the great lord of eternity," "the king of heaven and earth," "the lord of all beings," "the chief of the gods," and "the god of gods." But these titles do not seem to be meant exclusively. Merodach is held in considerable honour among the Assyrians, being often coupled with Asshur, or with Asshur and Nebo, as a war-god, one by whom kings gain victories and obtain the destruction of their enemies. But it is in Babylonia, and especially in the later Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadnezzar and Neriglissar, that his worship culminates. It is then that all the epithets of the highest honour are accumulated upon him, and that he becomes an almost exclusive object of worship; it is then that we find such expressions as—"I supplicate the king of gods, the lord of lords, in Borsippa, the city of his loftiness;" and "O god Merodach, great lord, lord of the house of the gods, light of the gods, father, even for thy high honour, which changeth not, a temple have I built!"

In his stellar character Merodach represented the planet Jupiter, with which he was supposed to have a very intimate connection. The eighth month, Marchesvan, was dedicated to him. In the second, Elul, he had three festivals—on the third, on the seventh, and on the sixteenth day.

Nergal, who presided over the planet Mars, was essentially a war god. His name signifies "the great man," or "the great hero;" and his commonest titles are "the mighty hero," "the king of battle," "the destroyer," "the champion of the gods," and "the great brother." He "goes before" the kings in their warlike expeditions, and helps them to confound and scatter their enemies. Nor is he above lending them his assistance when they indulge in the pleasures of the chase. One of his titles is "the god of hunting;" and, while originally subordinated to Nin in this relation, ultimately he outstrips his rival, and becomes the especial patron of hunters and sportsmen. Asshur-bani-pal, who is conspicuous among the Assyrian kings for his intense love of field sports, uniformly ascribes his successes to Nergal, and does not even join with him any other deity. Nergal's emblem was the human-headed and winged lion, which is usually seen, as it were on guard, at the entrances of the royal palaces.

Ishtar, who was called Nana by the Babylonians, corresponded both in name and attributes with the Astarte (or Ashtoreth) of the Phœnicians and Syrians. Like the Greek Aphrodité and the Roman Venus, she was the queen of love and beauty, the goddess who presided over marriage, and even over the loves of animals. Her own frailty was notorious. In one of the Izdubar legends she courts that romantic individual, who, however, declines her advances, reminding her that her favour had always proved fatal to those persons on whom she had previously bestowed her affections. There can be little doubt that—in Babylon at any rate—she was worshipped with unchaste rites, and that her cult was thus of a corrupting and debasing character. But, besides this soft and sensual aspect, Ishtar had a further and a nobler one. She corresponded not to Venus only, but also to Bellona, being called “the goddess of war and battle,” “the queen of victory,” “she who arranges battles,” and “she who defends from attack.” The Assyrian kings very generally unite her with Asshur in the accounts which they give of their military expeditions, speaking of their forces as those which Asshur and Ishtar have committed to their charge, of their battles as fought in the service of Asshur and Ishtar, and of their triumphs as the result of Asshur and Ishtar aiding them and exalting them above their enemies. Ishtar had also some general titles of a lofty but vague character; she was called “the fortunate,” “the happy,” “the great goddess,” “the mistress of heaven and earth,” and “the queen of all the gods and goddesses.” In her stellar character she presided over the planet Venus; and the sixth month, Elul, was dedicated to her.

Nebo, the last of the five planetary deities, presided over Mercury. It was his special function to have under his charge learning and knowledge. He is called “the god who possesses intelligence,” “he who hears from afar,” “he who teaches,” or “he who teaches and instructs.” The tablets of the royal library at Nineveh are said to contain “the wisdom of Nebo.” He is also, like Mercury, the minister of the gods, but scarcely their messenger—an office which belongs to a god called Paku. At the same time, as has been noticed in the case of other gods, Nebo has a number of general titles, implying divine power, which, if they had belonged to him alone, would have seemed to prove him to be the Supreme Deity. He is “the lord of lords, who has no equal in favour,” “the supreme chief,” “the sustainer,” “the supporter,” “the ever-ready,” “the guardian of heaven and earth,” “the lord of the constellations,” “the holder of the sceptre of power,” “he who grants to kings the sceptre of royalty for the governance of their people.” It is chiefly by his omission from several lists, combined with his humble place when he is mentioned together with the really “great gods” that we are assured of his occupying a (comparatively) low position in the general pantheon.

The planetary gods had in most cases a female counterpart. Nebo was closely associated with a goddess called Urmit or Tasmit; Nergal with one called Laz, and Merodach with Zir-panit or Zir-banit. Nin, the son of Bel

and Beltis, is sometimes made the husband of his mother, but otherwise has no female counterpart. Ishtar is sometimes coupled with Nebo in a way that might suggest her being his wife, if it were not that that position is certainly occupied by Urmit.

The Assyrians and Babylonians worshipped their gods in shrines or chapels of no very great size, to which, however, was frequently attached a lofty tower, built in stages, which were sometimes as many as seven. The tower could be ascended by steps on the outside, and was usually crowned by a small, but richly adorned, chapel. The gods were represented by images, which were either of stone or metal, and which bore the human form, excepting in two instances. Nin and Nergal were portrayed, as the Jews perhaps portrayed the cherubim, by animal forms of great size and grandeur, having human heads and huge outstretched wings. There was nothing hideous, or even grotesque, about the representations of the Assyrian gods. The object aimed at was to fill the spectator with feelings of awe and reverence ; and the divine figures have, in fact, universally, an appearance of calm, placid strength and majesty, which is solemn and impressive.

The gods were worshipped, as generally in the ancient world, by prayer, praise, and sacrifice. Prayer was offered both for one's self and others. The "sinfulness of sin" was deeply felt, and the divine anger deprecated with much earnestness. "O my lord," says one suppliant, "my sins are many, my trespasses are great ; and the wrath of the gods has plagued me with disease, and sickness, and sorrow. I fainted, but no one stretched forth his hand ; I groaned, but no one drew nigh ; I cried aloud, but no one heard. O Lord, do not thou abandon thy servant. In the waters of the great storm do thou lay hold of his hand. The sins which he has committed do thou turn to righteousness." Special intercession was made for the Assyrian kings. Praise was even more frequent than prayer. Hymns to the gods are numerous. Sacrifice almost always accompanied prayer and praise. Every day in the year seems to have been sacred to some deity or deities ; and some sacrifice or other was offered every day by the monarch, who thus set an example to his subjects, which they were probably not slow to follow. The principal sacrificial animals were bulls, oxen, sheep, and gazelles. Libations of wine, and the burning of incense were also parts of the recognised worship ; and offerings might be made of anything valuable.

It is an interesting question how far the Assyrians and Babylonians entertained any confident expectation of a future life ; and, if so, what view they took of it. That the idea did not occupy a prominent place in their minds, that there was a strong contrast in this respect between them and the people of Egypt, is palpable from the very small number of passages in which anything like an allusion to a future life can be even suspected. Still, there certainly seem to be places in which the continued existence of the dead is assumed, and where the happiness of the good and the

wretchedness of the wicked in the future state are indicated. In one passage the happiness of the king in another world seems to be prayed for. In two or three others, prayer is offered for a departing soul in terms like the following :—"May the Sun give him life, and Merodach grant him an abode of happiness !" Or, "To the Sun, the greatest of the gods, may he ascend ; and may the Sun, the greatest of the gods, receive his soul into his holy hands !" The nature of the happiness expected may be gathered from occasional notices, where the soul is represented as clad in a white, radiant garment, as dwelling in the presence of the gods, and as partaking of celestial food in the abodes of blessedness. On the other hand, Hades, the receptacle of the wicked after death, is spoken of as "the abode of darkness and famine"—the place "where earth is men's food, and their nourishment clay ; where light is not seen, but in darkness they dwell ; where ghosts, like birds, flutter their wings ; and on the door and the door-posts the dust lies undisturbed." Different degrees of wickedness seem to meet with different and appropriate punishments. There is one place—apparently, a penal fire—reserved for unfaithful wives and husbands, and for youths who have dishonoured their bodies. M. Lenormant seems, therefore, to be in error when he says that "though the Assyrians recognised a place of departed spirits, yet it was one in which there was no trace of a distinction of rewards and punishments."

Among the sacred legends of the Babylonians and Assyrians the following were the most remarkable. They believed that at a remote date, before the creation of the world, there had been war in heaven. Seven spirits, created by Anu to be his messengers, took council together, and resolved to revolt. "Against high heaven, the dwelling-place of Anu the king, they plotted evil," and unexpectedly made a fierce attack. The moon-god, the sun-god, and Vul, the god of the atmosphere, withstood them, and after a fearful struggle beat them off. Then there was peace for a while. But once more, at a later date, a fresh revolt broke out. The hosts of heaven were assembled together, in number five thousand, and were engaged in singing a psalm of praise to Anu, when suddenly discord arose. "With a loud cry of contempt" a portion of the angelic choir "broke up the holy song," uttering wicked blasphemies, and so, "spoiling, confusing, confounding, the hymn of praise." Asshur was invited to put himself at the head of the rebels, but "refused to go forth with them." Their leader, who is unnamed, took the form of a dragon, and in that shape contended with the god Bel, who proved victorious in the combat, and slew his adversary by means of a thunderbolt, which he flung into the dragon's gaping mouth. Upon this the entire host of the wicked angels took to flight, and was driven to the abode of the seven spirits of evil, where they were forced to remain, their return to heaven being forbidden. In their room man was created.

The Chaldean legend of Creation, according to Berosus, was the following : "In the beginning all was darkness and water, and therein were

generated monstrous animals of strange and peculiar shapes. There were men with two wings, and some even with four, and with two faces, and others with two heads, a man's and a woman's; and there were men with the heads and horns of goats, and men with hoofs like horses; and some with the upper parts of a man joined to the lower parts of a horse, like centaurs; and there were bulls with human heads, dogs with four bodies and with fishes' tails; men and horses with dogs' heads; creatures with the heads and bodies of horses, but with the tails of fish; and other animals mixing the forms of various beasts. Moreover there were monstrous fishes and reptiles and serpents, and divers other creatures which had borrowed something from each others' shapes, of all which the likenesses are still preserved in the temple of Bel. A woman ruled them all, by name Omorka, which means 'the sea.' Then Bel came forward and split the woman in twain; and of the one half of her he made the heaven, and of the other half the earth; and the beasts that were in her he caused to perish. And he split the darkness, and divided the heaven and the earth asunder, and set the world in order, and the animals that could not bear the light perished. Bel, upon this, seeing that the earth was desolate, yet teeming with productive power, commanded one of the gods to cut off his head, and to mix the blood which flowed forth with earth, and form men therewith, and beasts that could bear the light. So man was made, and was intelligent, being a partaker of the divine wisdom. Likewise Bel made the stars, and the sun and moon, and the five planets.

The legend of the descent of Ishtar into Hades runs as follows: "To the land of Hades, the land of her desire, Ishtar, the daughter of the moon-god Sin, turned her mind. When Ishtar arrived at the gate of Hades, to the keeper of the gate she spake: 'O Keeper of the entrance open thy gate! Open thy gate, I say again, that I may enter in! If thou openest not thy gate, if thou dost not let me in, I will assault the door, the gate I will break down, I will attack the entrance, I will split open the portals. I will raise the dead to be the devourers of the living! Upon the living the dead shall prey!' Then the porter opened his mouth and spake, and thus he said to great Ishtar: 'Stay, lady, do not shake down the door; I will go and inform Queen Ninkigal.' So the porter went in, and to Ninkigal said: 'Curses thy sister Ishtar utters; yea, she blasphemes thee with fearful curses.' And Ninkigal, hearing his words, grew pale, like a flower when cut from the stem. Like the stalk of a reed she shook. And she said, 'I will cure her rage; I will speedily cure her fury. Her curses I will repay. Light up consuming flames! Light up a blaze of straw! Be her doom with the husbands who left their wives; be her doom with the wives who forsook their lords; be her doom with the youths of dishonoured lives. Go, porter, and open the gate for her; but strip her, as some have been stripped ere now.' The porter went and opened the gate. 'Lady of Tiggaba enter,' he said; 'enter, it is permitted. The Queen of Hades to meet thee comes.' So the first gate let her in; but

she was stopped, and there the great crown was taken from her head. 'Keeper, do not remove from me the crown that is on my head.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists upon its removal.' The next gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the earrings were taken from her ears. 'Keeper, do not take off from me the earrings from my ears.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists upon their removal.' The third gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the precious stones were taken from her head. 'Keeper, do not take off from me the gems that adorn my head.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists on their removal.' The fourth gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the small jewels were taken from her brow. 'Keeper, do not take off from me the small jewels that deck my brow.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists upon their removal.' The fifth gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the girdle was taken from her waist. 'Keeper, do not take off from me the girdle that girds my waist.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists upon its removal.' The sixth gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the gold rings were taken from her hands and feet. 'Keeper, do not take off from me the gold rings of my hands and feet.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists upon their removal.' The seventh gate let her in, but she was stopped, and there the last garment was taken from her body. 'Keeper, do not take off, I pray, the last garment from my body.' 'Excuse it, lady, the queen of the land insists on its removal.'

"After Mother Ishtar had descended into Hades, Ninkigal saw her and derided her to her face. Then Ishtar lost her reason, and heaped curses upon the other. Ninkigal upon this opened her mouth and spake: 'Go, Namtar, and bring her out for punishment. Afflict her with disease of the eye, the side, the feet, the heart, the head.'

"The divine messenger of the gods lacerated his face before them. The assembly of the gods was full. The Sun came, and with him the Moon his father, and thus spake he weeping unto Hea, the king. 'Ishtar has descended into the earth, and has not risen again; and ever since the time that Mother Ishtar descended into hell the master has ceased from commanding, the slave has ceased from obeying.' Then the god Hea in the depth of his mind formed a design; he modelled for her escape the figure of a man in clay. 'Go and save her, Phantom,' he said, 'Present thyself at the portal of Hades; the seven gates of Hades will all open before thee. Ninkigal will see thee and take pleasure because of thee. When her mind has grown calm, and her anger has worn itself away, awe her with the names of the great gods. Then prepare thy frauds. On deceitful tricks fix thy mind. Use the very chiefest of thy deceits. Bring forth fish out of an empty vessel. That will astonish Ninkigal, and to Ishtar she will restore her dress. Thy reward—a great reward—for these things shall not fail. Go, Phantom, save her, and the assembly of the people shall crown thee! Meats, the best in the city, shall be thy food!

Wines, the most delicious in the city, shall be thy drink. A royal palace shall be thy dwelling—a throne of state thy seat. Magician and conjuror shall kiss the hem of thy garment.'

"Ninkigal opened her mouth and spake; to her messenger Namtar, command she gave: 'Go, Namtar, the temple of justice adorn! Deck the images! Deck the altars! Bring out Anunnak, and let him take his seat on a throne of gold! Pour out for Ishtar the water of life; from my realms let her depart.' Namar obeyed; he adorned the temple, decked the images, decked the altars; brought out Anunnak and set him on a throne of gold; poured out for Ishtar the water of life, and suffered her to depart. Then the first gate let her out, and gave her back the garment of her form. The second gate let her out, and gave her back the jewels for her hands and feet. The third gate let her out, and gave her back the girdle for her waist. The fourth gate let her out, and gave her back the small gems she had worn upon her brow. The fifth gate let her out, and gave her back the precious stones that had been upon her head. The sixth gate let her out, and gave her back the earrings that were taken from her ears. And the seventh gate let her out, and gave her back the crown she had carried on her head."

So ends this curious legend. There are many others, especially an account of the Deluge, which is of great interest. But the inexorable march of time warns me that I must not trespass longer upon your patience, but must thank you for your kind attention, and make my bow.

ANCIENT JUDAISM

By ^{THE} REV. A. W. OXFORD.

I. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY.

OUR chief authorities for the history of Israel are the books of the Old Testament. Unfortunately none of the historical books have reached us in their original form ; they have been worked up by later historians whose aim was not to accurately reproduce the past so much as to paint such a picture of it as would best convey religious instruction to the men of their own generation. To gain this end they did not scruple to make any alterations, additions, and omissions which served to bring the books more into accordance with their own ideas. In order, then, to recover the original documents which lie at the bottom of the historical books of the Old Testament, we have to omit the later additions, supply the omissions, restore the corrections. Although this may seem at first sight almost impossible, it is made comparatively easy by three circumstances. Firstly, the old historians had no motive for concealing the process by which they worked, and therefore made no attempt to alter the style and phraseology of the documents which lay before them.¹ Secondly, they were rarely skilful workmen, they often failed to make the necessary alterations in the old histories which they incorporated with their own.² Thirdly, we have in the writings of the prophets a fixed point by means of which we can establish the dates of the various revisions which the books have undergone. We may, besides, gain considerable assistance from the translation of the LXX, especially where the Hebrew text is corrupt.

I. THE HEXATEUCH.

We can only in the briefest manner indicate the chief results of the modern criticism of the Hexateuch ; the arguments for and against them may be found fully discussed in Kuenen's "Hexateuch," Wellhausen's "Prolegomena," pp. 295-362, and his "Skizzen und Vorarbeiten," Part II.

(a) The oldest portion of the Hexateuch is called the Jehovistic history book, and is denoted by the symbol JE. It consists of two parts : the author of the first part is called the Jehovist (J) from his using the word Jehovah for God ; the author of the second the Elohist (E) from his using the word Elohim. J was composed about the year 800 B.C. ;³ its author is claimed as a native of Judæa by Stade and

¹ Even if they had wished to do this, the simplicity of the Hebrew language would have prevented them.

² Sometimes they left different narratives of the same event standing side by side.

³ Kuenen, *Hexateuch* 249, note (23).

Wellhausen, as a northerner by Kuenen. The Elohist was certainly an Ephraimite; he wrote about the year 750 B.C.¹ Kuenen argues² that Judæan editions were subsequently published both of J and E. The two books were united at the close of the seventh or the beginning of the sixth century.

(b) The next portion of the Hexateuch is the Deuteronomic (D). It originally consisted merely of Deut. v. to xxvi.³ and was published in the eighteenth year of king Josiah (B.C. 621). At a subsequent period—not earlier than B.C. 597—the addition was made of i. 1 to iv. 30, together with xxxi. 1-8, and perhaps chapters xxix. and xxx. Later again the Deuteronomic torah was united with JE; about this time were added the sections xxvii. 1-8; xxxi. 24-30; xxxii. 44-47; xxxiv. 4, 6, 7a, 11, 12.

(c) There remains what is called the priestly portion (P). This consists mainly of a priestly torah (P₁) and a later historico-legislative work (P₂). The latter was brought to Judæa by Ezra and Nehemiah in the year 444 B.C. and had been composed not long before. It is uncertain whether it was amalgamated with P₁ in Babylonia or at a later date in Judæa. Later again supplements were made to P₁P₂ (P₃, etc.) and finally P and JED were united by redactors (R) before the end of the fifth century, although slight alterations continued to be made until some time in the third century.

It was mainly in connection with D that the historical books of the Old Testament were revised. The redaction is marked by the introduction of anonymous prophets, the change from "angel of Jehovah" to "Jehovah," and the ideas that sin must have preceded misfortune, that Israel always acted as a whole, and that the influence of a great saint must have made Israel faithful to Jehovah. Occasionally the influence of P has been at work: it can generally be discovered by the distinction between priest and Levite, the mention of the tabernacle, the use of the terms "high" priest and "congregation," and by the designation of the months by numbers.

2. THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

The Book of Judges consists of an introduction, i. 1 to ii. 5, the main body of the work, ii. 6 to xvi. 31, and two appendices, chapters xvii. and xviii. and chapters xix., xx., and xxi.

The introduction has been connected with the Book of Joshua by the words "after the death of Joshua." It is not, however, a continuation of that book, but a parallel to it, since the west-Jordan land is not yet conquered and some events are common to both histories.⁴ The contents of

¹ Hexateuch, 250, note (24). But compare Renan, ii. 379. ² Hexateuch, 248.

³ The introduction, v.-xi., is ascribed by Wellhausen to another author than that of xii.-xxvi.

⁴ Compare Judges i. 10-15, with Josh. xv. 13-19; i. 21, with xv. 63; i. 27, 28, with xvii. 12, 14; i. 29, with xvi. 10.

the introduction are most important, though they are in part unhistorical,¹ sometimes even contradictory.²

The main body of the work is complete in itself and follows Joshua, xxiv. 28, as suitably as its own introduction, i. 1 to ii. 5. Various additions have been made to the original history, as for example, in chapters iv., vi. 1 to viii. 3,³ the differences in the religious attitude of these show that they are due to a process of glorification. Afterwards the book was revised under the influence of Deuteronomy. For this purpose a prologue (ii. 6 to iii. 6) was added and the whole history altered in accordance with it; in monotonous repetition, rebellion is followed by affliction, affliction by conversion, conversion by peace. At the same time the book was forced into a chronological scheme, the key to which is found in 1 Kings vi. 1. The 480 years are twelve generations of forty years each. The wandering in the wilderness, the generation of Joshua and his surviving contemporaries (Judges ii. 7), the periods of rest under Othniel, Deborah, and Jerubbaal, account for 5×40 , the rest under Ehud for 2×40 , the dominion of the Philistines,⁴ the reigns of Saul and David for 3×40 . The remaining eighty consist either of the seventy-one years of foreign rule (excluding the Philistine dominion) or of the seventy years of the minor judges,⁵ with a balance of nine or ten years, which must be distributed between Jephthah (six years), and either Solomon (until the temple was built) or Abimelech.

We may notice striking differences between the original history and its Deuteronomic redaction.

(1) The latter of course is Judaic, whilst the former is so far from being so that in the song of Deborah Judah is not even mentioned. To rectify this error the redactor has opened the series of judges with Othniel, who was not a person but a clan.⁶

(2) The historical continuity which is given by the chronological scheme, cannot be traced in the original narratives.

(3) The histories are those of tribal heroes, not of a united Israel; the tribes only combine against a common foe, such as Sisera, receiving thereby extraordinary praise from Deborah. The judges did not rule over the whole of Israel, every man did what was right in his own eyes.

¹ I. 8, 18.

² e.g. Compare i. 11 with verses 12-15, verses 19-21 seem to be an addition, for 19 is a correction of 18, 20 of 10, 21 of 8; verse ii. 1 is a parallel of Josh. xviii. 1 (i. 22; Gen. xxxv. 8). It is clear that ii. 18-52 is a Deuteronomic addition.

³ Doubtless also the stories of Jephthah and Samson were originally profane, and received their religious colouring at a later date.

⁴ Coinciding with Eli's sixty years, and covering also Samson's twenty and the twenty of 1 Sam. vii. 2.

⁵ Almost certainly the former, see note (3) on page 45.

⁶ 1 Chr. xxvii. 15. The name was suggested by i. 13. Cushan-rishathaim is king of too remote a people to be Israel's enemy at that time, and his name "negro of double wickedness," shows that he is not an historical figure, but a bogie of popular legend.

(4) The Deuteronomic contrast between absolute oppression and absolute peace is false; while some tribes dwelt in peace, others were struggling against enemies.

(5) Israel was not guilty of any religious declension as vi. 13 incidentally discloses. The Baalim were the gods worshipped in different sanctuaries of the land, each of whom was supposed to be Jehovah,¹ the Ashtaroth were almost certainly the Aschera or sacred poles, which are frequently mentioned as standing by the altar of Jehovah.²

Twelve judges are named in the book, though little is told of seven of them: these minor judges were probably added to complete the number twelve.³

Of Othniel we have already spoken. Ehud was perhaps a Benjaminite family,⁴ his story does not bear any distinct trace of its being a real history. Shamgar was probably an historical personage borrowed from v. 6 by the redactor who also invented the statement of iii. 31. Tolai was a clan of Issachar,⁵ Jair of Gilead,⁶ Elon was a name of a town in Zebulun,⁷ Ibzan and Abdon also were doubtless clans.

The story of Jephthah is an attempt to give an historical setting to the feast which was celebrated at Gilead. From xi. 1 we must conclude that Jephthah was one of the minor clans of Gilead. Cap. x. 6-16 is of course Deuteronomic; verses 17, 18 are an attempt to attach the section to chapter xi. Cap. xi. 12-29 is a late addition, borrowed from Numbers xx. and xxi.⁸ since xi. 11b is connected with xi. 30 and verses 28 and 29 anticipate 32. Cap. xii. 1-7 is likewise a late addition⁹ copied from the story of Gideon by a Judaic writer, who did not admire his yielding temper towards the proud northern tribe.

Samson is no real Judge, since he acts only for himself and does not rule his tribe.¹⁰ He is partly a mythological figure,¹¹ partly a legendary hero. His history bears many striking resemblances to those of Jerubbaal

¹ Just as the Virgin Mary is worshipped now in Roman Catholic countries.

² See page 56 and Renan i. 230.

³ Stade thinks that Abimelech was originally one of the twelve, and that Shamgar was afterwards inserted by a later redactor, who refused to regard Abimelech as a judge. This view is supported by the connection of iv. 1 with iii. 30, instead of with iii. 31. He thinks, also, that there were two Deuteronomic redactions, since the minor judges are introduced in a different way from the others, and the chronological scheme does not take in the number of years during which they ruled.

⁴ 1 Chr. vii. 10; viii. 6.

⁵ Numb. xxvi. 23.

⁶ Numb. xxxii. 41. The word for ass and city is in Hebrew the same.

⁷ Gen. xli. 14.

⁸ As we see from the introduction of Moab and Chemosh (xi. 24).

⁹ For Jephthah has already been home for two months (xi. 39). The Shibboleth story and the number of Ephraimites slain by Jephthah are incredible.

¹⁰ Gen. xlix. 16 can only mean that Dan will keep its political independence and not meet with the fate of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi.

¹¹ His name means "sun-man;" his long hair symbolizes the rays of the sun. Other traits of the sun-god are more or less clear. See Goldziher.

and Saul¹ Perhaps he was a Benjamite clan dwelling on the borders of Palestine and Philistia.

We have still to notice the two appendices. The first of these is one of the most valuable of the Old Testament as giving a correct view of the religion of Israel before the time of the kings. We probably owe its preservation to the fact that it would serve to throw contempt on the sanctuary of Dan. It has been redacted, but not by a Deuteronomist.² The second is a much later document³ having points of contact both with D and P and standing therefore between them. In it Israel acts not only as a whole but as the congregation of the covenant. The absurdities of the narrative and its contrasts with the rest of the book are obvious. It has been constructed in parts from older portions of the Old Testament⁴ and has as its foundation the hate which was felt by Judah towards the pre-davidic rule of Benjamin.

3. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

The Books of Samuel form only one book in the Hebrew MSS. Their contents fall into three parts: ⁵ 1 Sam. i. 1 to xiv. 51; 1 Sam. xiv. 52 to 2 Sam. viii. 18; 2 Sam. ix. 1 to xx. 26; at the end is an appendix, 2 Sam. xxi. to xxiv.

The third part, 2 Sam. ix. 1 to xx. 26, to which formerly 1 Kings i. and ii. belonged, is the most faithful history, and has been but slightly redacted. The second part, 1 Sam. xiv. 52 to 2 Sam. viii. 18, is hardly less valuable, though its original form has suffered many interruptions and alterations. In the earlier chapters of the book, 1 Sam. i. 1 to xiv. 51, which narrate the transition to the monarchy, the Deuteronomic redaction has been more thorough. We find in them the old strain⁶—rebellion, affliction, conversion, peace—and also traces of a chronological scheme.⁷

¹ Compare xiii. 9-23 with vi. 11-24, esp. xiii. 19 with vi. 21. Compare also xiii. 5 with 1 Sam. ix. 16. The life, work, and end of Samson and Saul are similar.

² Since xvii. 5 follows xvii. 1, the intermediate verses must be a later addition. The text of xviii. 14-18 was probably altered when these verses were added. Verses 18-30 is also an interpolation, since the original narrative is certainly earlier than the fall of Samaria.

³ As the Hebrew shows. See Bleek-Wellhausen 202. These chapters are fully treated in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1885, p. 30.

⁴ Gen. xix.; Josh. 8. Compare also xix. 27 with 1 Sam. iii. 15; xix. 29 with 1 Sam. xi. 7; xx. 13 with 1 Sam. xi. 12; xx. 16 with iii. 15; xx. 26 with ii. 4, 5; xx. 45 with viii. 2; xx. 47 with 2 Sam. ii. 25; xxi. 15 with 2 Sam. vi. 8. The comparison of xxi. 8 with 1 Sam. xi. is curious.

⁵ The first part divides again into sections. It is plain that 1 Sam. xv. is related both to the first and second parts; the connecting verse, 1 Sam. xiv. 52, is older than the Deuteronomic redaction.

⁶ Sam. vii. 2-4; xii. 1-5.

⁷ 1 Sam. iv. 18; vii. 2; xlii. 1. Note also xxvii. 7; 2 Sam. ii. 10, 11; v. 4, 5; 1 Kings ii. 11. In 1 Sam. xlii. 1, and 2 Sam. ii. 10, the numbers have not been filled in. The omission of 1 Sam. xlii. 1 in the LXX. shows the late date of the chronological redaction.

On the whole, the Books of Samuel have suffered far less from revision than the Book of Judges. The time covered by them being short, and the narrative being rich in incident and forming a connected whole, it was not so easy to force them into an artificial framework.

4. THE BOOKS OF THE KINGS.

The Books of the Kings, like the Books of Samuel, form only one book in the Hebrew MSS. They fall into two parts, the first containing the history of Solomon (1 Kings i.-xi.), the second containing the history of the other kings of Israel and Judah (1 Kings xii. to 2 Kings xxv.). From the second part we may separate 2 Kings xxiii. 30 to xxv. 30, which has been added at the earliest during the exile at the time when 1 Kings xii. to 2 Kings xxiii. 29 was subjected to revision.

It is easy to see that the redaction of 1 Kings i. to xi. much resembles the redaction of the Books of Samuel. The redaction of the second part, however, is more like that of the Book of Judges, for we find a framework consisting of chronological and religious elements into which the history is forced. At the same time there is a great difference between the two. In the Book of Judges the framework was imposed on material which already existed; in the case of the Books of the Kings the Deuteronomic redactor is also the real author. Having prepared his framework he made, from the sources before him, selections which now only exist as part of his work.

In the treatment of his subject the author has adopted the unhistorical plan of separating the histories of the kings of Israel and Judah. Only in the case of Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah has he made any attempt to treat the fortunes of the two kingdoms in one narrative. Moreover, he includes the history of each king in a separate section, which begins and ends in a fixed way.¹ With the kings of Judah the opening sentence is: "A, the son of B, began to reign over Judah in the *n*th year of C, king of Israel. A was *x* years old when he began to reign; and he reigned *y* years in Jerusalem, and his mother's name was D, the daughter of E." The conclusion runs, "Now the rest of the acts of A and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah? And A slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the city of David; and F his son reigned in his stead." In the case of the kings of Israel, the age and mother's name are omitted, and of course Israel and Samaria take the place of Judah, Jerusalem, and the city of David.

Within these opening and closing formulæ we have short histories of

¹ Much confusion is caused by this method. The acts of one and the same man are found in different sections, if some were performed before his accession to the throne and others after it. Matters which concern both Israel and Judah are mentioned twice (2 Kings xvii. 1-6; xviii. 9-12). Other instances of confusion are given in Stade 76. 77.

the different reigns. These are not only most meagre, but also inaccurate. The author believes that the Deuteronomistic law was, from the time of Moses, the law of Israel. Everything, therefore, in the old history which is contrary to this law is, in his eyes, a sin; kings who do not act in accordance with it are wicked kings. All the kings of Israel, being unable to worship at Jerusalem, are thus denounced as wicked.¹ Correlatively the kings of Judah, though reproached for not putting away the high places, are not so emphatically condemned.

The interest of the author, as we should naturally imagine from his Deuteronomistic standpoint, centres round the temple. What few detailed narratives are given generally have the temple as their scene of action.² Other matters concern him but little. Even of such kings as Jeroboam I., Omri, Jeroboam II., he finds little worthy of mention; he is content to refer his readers to the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel, which unfortunately has not been preserved.

This second section of the books of the kings has been redacted and furnished with a conclusion by a later writer, whose standpoint is almost precisely that of his predecessor. In one important respect, however, he differs from him. From the story of Josiah's reign we must conclude that its author hoped that the king's reformation would serve to turn away from Judah the divine wrath and so save it from its threatened destruction. The redactor knew that the hope proved vain, and he attributed this, as did Jeremiah,³ to the fact that Manasseh's sin was too great to be forgotten. In order to bring the whole of the book into harmony with this conviction, he added such passages as 2 Kings xvii. 19, 20; xxi. 10-15; xxiii. 26, 27; probably also 1 Kings viii. in greater part; xiii.; 2 Kings xxii. 15-20.

It may be either the same or a later redactor who has added the chronological part of the framework. The attempt to synchronize the individual reigns of course dates from the exile or later, since Israel would not stoop to reckon the years of its kings by those of the kings of such an insignificant State as Judah, nor would Judah, on its side, pay any attention in its chronology to a kingdom which it regarded as having revolted from the Davidic rule. The synchronism is incorrect, as we see at once by a comparison of the two series of dates.⁴

The history of Israel, up to the end of the Captivity, falls into two periods, each of 480 years. The first period begins with the Exodus and ends with the building of Solomon's temple, the second proceeds from this to the end of the exile. Eras are rarely fixed by contemporaries, who, as a rule, fail to see the importance of events happening in their own

¹ This condemnation becomes ludicrous in the case of Zimri, who only reigned a week. 1 Kings xvi. 15.

² Kings xi. seq.; xvi.; xxii. seq. Only in xviii. seq. does the prophetic interest predominate. Even in such passages as 2 Kings xii. 18; xiv. 14, the interest in the temple creeps in.

³ Jer. xv. 4.

⁴ Details are given in Stade, 93-95.

days. It is absolutely certain that the erection of Solomon's temple, which was, at first, no more than a royal chapel, could never have been regarded as an era until the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law. At the very outset then we are led to doubt the accuracy of the dates.

This doubt becomes a certainty when we find that, as in the first period, the number forty is the basis of calculation. Omitting the kings who reigned less than a year,¹ we have the following list :

Rehoboam	17	}	20
Abijam	3		
Asa	41	}	40 + 1
Jehoshaphat	25		
Joram	8	}	40
Ahaziah	1		
Athaliah	6		
Joash	40	}	40
Amaziah	29		
Uzziah	52	}	2 × 40 + 1
Jotham	16		
Ahaz	16	}	40 - 2
Hezekiah ²	6		
Hezekiah	23	}	2 × 40
Manasseh	55		
Amon	2		
Josiah	31	}	53 ³
Jehoiakim	11		
Zedekiah	11		
			<hr/>
Duration of exile			393
Solomon after the temple			50
			37
			<hr/>
			480

The series of the kings of Israel depends on that of the kings of Judah. According to the latter, the kingdom of Israel lasted 242 years. From the division of the kingdom to the revolution of Jehu, we have, according to the northern series, ninety-eight years, according to the southern, ninety-six. If we correct the length of Baasha's reign from twenty-four to twenty-two years, the two series each consist of ninety-six years, and we

¹ The Israelites, like other Eastern nations, reckoned as the first year of a king the year following that of his ascending the throne. For proof of this see Stade, 98, 99.

² Up to B.C. 722, the destruction of Samaria.

³ It is curious that we get again 2 × 40 by adding to this the last date in the books of the Kings (2 Kings xxv. 27).

get as the duration of Israel 240, *i.e.* the half of 480. We have then the following list:—

Jeroboam	22
Nadab	2
Baasha	22
Elah	2
Omri	12
Ahab	22
Ahaziah	2
Jehoram	12

Thus two kings have the average twelve; the others consist of three pairs of father and son, the father getting 12 + 10 years, the son, who is less important, 12—10.

Nine kings, from Jehu to Hoshea, share the remaining 144 years. The chronological division here is not yet clear, though we may note that $144 = 16 \times 9$.

5. THE PROPHETIC LITERATURE.

Only a few general remarks can be made on the writings of the prophets. They are of immense importance in furnishing us with accounts of historical events as well as in enabling us to trace the development of religion in ancient Israel. Without them it would have been impossible to have obtained an accurate history from the sixth to the eighth century, since, as we have already seen, the historical books give as a rule only meagre narratives, and even start from false premises. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that the writings of the prophets are all written from one point of view. But since this point of view is known, we are able to correct their judgments of historical persons and events. Moreover it was not the direct object of the prophets to write history. Though therefore they have at times given a mistaken judgment on some matter, they have not pushed this judgment to its natural consequences, and have left us with sufficient information to enable us to set the event in its true light.

We must remember, too, that the prophetic writings which remain to us only represent one development of prophecy.¹ The writings of the so-called "false" prophets have all perished, because they were developed on other lines; and even those which we now possess have for the most part suffered from redaction at the time they were received into the canon in order to bring them into more thorough agreement with the fixed standard of development which had been adopted.

6. THE BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES.

The Books of the Chronicles, like the Books of Samuel and the Kings form only one book in the original Hebrew MSS. Formerly the Books c

¹ See Renan II. 435, 439.

Ezra and Nehemiah, which were also once one book, were a part of this work, since the concluding verses of the Chronicles (2 Chr. xxxvi. 22, 23) are identical with the opening verses of Ezra (Ez. i. 1-3). Ezra and Nehemiah, however, were received into the canon before the Books of the Chronicles, probably because the latter treated of events of which there was already a canonical history. There is abundant proof that the whole work cannot have been composed before the year 300 B.C.¹

The narrative of the Chronicles differs widely from that of the Books of Samuel and the Kings; but it is obvious that the variations all spring from the one desire to Judaize the past and to represent the priestly law as having been from the time of Moses the law of Israel.² It is thus without value as an authority for the history of Israel. It is true that the author of the Chronicles gives frequent references to other writings; but these are all different parts of one and the same book, which can be nothing else than an "apocryphal amplification" of the Books of the Kings³ after the manner in which the scribes treated the sacred history. "It is indeed possible that occasionally a grain of good corn may occur among the chaff, but to be conscientious one must neglect this possibility of exceptions, and give due honour to the probability of the rule."⁴

Since the chronicler has adopted into his work large portions of the Books of Samuel and the Kings, he is sometimes of service in settling the text of corrupted passages.

7. ANCIENT INSCRIPTIONS.

(a) The Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions are of great importance to the historian, not only because they narrate many events of which the Israelite history is silent, but also because they often narrate the same events as the latter and so enable us to correct many one-sided impressions. Their chief value however lies in their furnishing us with the only means we possess of fixing the chronology of the Israelite history. During the period between 722 and 586 B.C. we are occasionally able to test and correct the artificial chronology of the historical books of the Old Testament by means of the prophetic writings; but otherwise we are completely dependent on the inscriptions. As the Assyrians and Babylonians possessed an accurate chronology,⁵ we are able to definitely fix the dates of many leading events in the Israelite history.

¹ e.g. In the genealogy of the house of David (1 Chr. iii.) six generations after Zerubabel are given. If we reckon a generation at thirty years, we come down to the year 330 B.C.

² Full details are given in Wellhausen, 171-227.

³ That it is not the Books of Kings themselves is clear from 1 Chr. ix. 1; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 19. The use of the word "midrash" in 2 Chr. xiii. 22; xxiv. 27, shows what the work really was.

⁴ Wellhausen, 224.

⁵ The ancient Hebrews, on the contrary, reckoned only by the years of their kings, or by some striking event (Amos i. 1).

(b) The Egyptian inscriptions and papyri are of less value, since they are rarely concerned with Israel and its history. Only of one event, the expedition of Shishak, do they give a more detailed narrative than we otherwise possess. They are of use in giving us a general view of the situation during the period of conflict between Egypt and Assyria, and sometimes, though the Egyptians had no fixed era and chronology like the Assyrians, help us to correct the chronological statements of the Israelite historians.

II. THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT JUDAISM.

The Israelites, who had no conception of the world as a universe, were of course unable to reach the conception of an infinite and supreme God, the maker of heaven and earth, in whom all live and move, and have their being. Jehovah¹ was but one god by the side of many others, as is shown by the fact of his bearing a proper name, by which he was distinguished from other gods. Jehovah, however, was Israel's only god, the relation between Jehovah and Israel excluded all other worship; in ancient Israel monolatry existed, but not monotheism. The very existence of other nations was enough to prove to Israel that there were other gods. Jehovah was Israel's god as Chemosh was god of Moab and Milcom of Ammon. These gods gave the nations their territories and protected them, just as Jehovah gave to the Israelites Canaan and there protected them.

It is clear from 1 Kings iii. 27, where the "indignation" is that of Chemosh, that Jehovah reigned only in Israel, and that in foreign territory he was inferior to the gods of the land. If an Israelite then moved into another country, he was compelled to worship its god. (1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Kings v. 17.) The same thing of course held good for foreigners coming to Israel. (1 Kings xi. 7, 8.) Side by side, however, with this idea of the limit of Jehovah's authority, lay a strong religious conviction that he did exercise his power in foreign lands, a conviction based on the feeling that he was more powerful than other gods. (1 Sam. v.; Isa. xix. 1; Gen. xxviii. 15; xxxix. 2; xlv. 3; 1 Kings xvii.)

Israel's God was, like the gods of other ancient nations, a spiritual, personal being. Anthropopathic and anthropomorphic ideas abounded, because the Israelite was only able to picture Jehovah to himself after the analogy of his own nature. But this was an advantage, for here lay the power and vividness of the old Israelite faith; and here Jehovah gradually acquired the moral traits which distinguished him from the nature gods, and gave rise to the idea that he was a god above nature and apart from it.

¹ The derivation of Jehovah, or Yahvêh, is uncertain. The most common interpretations of the word are, "He that is," or "He that calls into being." A much more likely derivation is from a root meaning, "to fall"; Jehovah, then, would be, "He who makes fall," that is, he who strikes down his enemies with his thunderbolts.

The moral grandeur of Jehovah was only first clearly seen by the prophets; the old idea of his holiness was closely connected with that of his power. Since he was mighty, he exacted worship and respect; no one could look on him and not die. (Gen. xxxii. 30; Ex. xxxiii. 20; Deut. v. 4; Judges vi. 22; xiii. 22; Isa. vi. 5.) This thought dominated the whole range of the cultus, since, not only did every one who wished to approach God have to do so with prescribed forms, but everything given to God shared in his holiness, and any profanation was visited with most fearful punishment. Such passages as 1 Sam. vi. 19, 20, and 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7, show that the conception of Jehovah's holiness had nothing moral in it.

Another proof of this is given by the circumstance that the old Israelites knew no distinction between physical and moral evil. Jehovah was boldly represented as the author of the one as well as of the other, leading men astray by urging them to deeds which called down the divine wrath and worked their ruin. Examples of this are found in 1 Kings xii. 15; xxii. 20, 23; Judges ix. 23; and especially in 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, where the contrast between Jehovah and the children of men is most striking.

Ancient Israel therefore represented Jehovah, not as a loving Father, but as a Being easily roused to wrath. In every abnormal course of events his anger was seen, and every effort was at once made to appease it. (2 Sam. vi. 12-15.)

In all these respects Jehovah was like the gods of other nations. The great difference between them lay in the representation of Jehovah as a jealous god, one who tolerated no other worship by the side of his own.¹ Jehovah demanded from Israel complete faithfulness, while Israel, on the other hand, looked to Jehovah for help and succour in all need² and expected him to lead them forth against their enemies. (Judges v. 4; Numb. xxi. 14; 1 Sam. xxv. 28.) This last idea finds a visible expression in the custom of taking the ark into battle. It is perhaps from this belief in Jehovah as their leader in war, that the Israelites gave him the title of "Lord of Hosts."

This conception of Jehovah as a jealous god; demanding the entire reverence of his people, destroyed the old worship of ancestors, and prevented the Israelites from falling, like other nations, into polytheism. It is a conception peculiar to Israel, and not, as has been sometimes said, common to all Semitic peoples. It must have been a characteristic of the Jehovistic religion from the first, for Israel could hardly have reached it while exposed to the polytheistic ideas of other nations; that is, it must owe its origin to Moses himself.

Jehovah was not represented as either omnipotent, omniscient, or omnipresent.³ It was enough for his worshippers to picture him as possessing power and knowledge far above that of men, and as always listen-

¹ This idea became universal only in the prophetic age, but it is a direct development of the Mosaic conception of Jehovah.

² In Exodus xi. 2 he incites Israel to theft.

³ Gen. xviii. 17, 21.

ing to their prayers and coming to their aid in time of need. His presence was chiefly seen in what was unusual and unexpected. If a man said or did anything which was beyond ordinary human attainment, he was supposed to be possessed by Jehovah's spirit. Madness, too, was regarded as divine possession. (1 Sam. xvi. 14; xviii. 10.) In later times these spirits were personified, and became, some angels, some demons. (1 Kings xxii. 19-22.)

When Jehovah appeared to his worshippers, it was in the form of a man; to his enemies he appeared robed in terrible majesty. Many expressions lead us to imagine that Jehovah was originally the storm god, and that his presence was recognised in every thunder-cloud. (Judges v. 4; vi. 21; Ps. xxix.; Ex. xix. 16; iii. 2; 1 Kings viii. 10; xviii. 38; Isa. vi.)

Since the sight of Jehovah brought death, the thunder-clouds which concealed him were regarded as friendly spirits; they were called Cherubim. (Ps. xviii. 10; 1 Kings vi. 23.) The flashes of lightning, too, were regarded as spirits, and called Seraphim, probably from an old idea that they were snakes. (Isa. vi. 6; 2 Kings xviii. 4.)

A belief in spirits was common to all desert tribes.¹ All appearances of friendly spirits the Israelites referred to Jehovah, either to the god himself or to his angel. Often as soon as the angel was recognised, he was regarded as Jehovah,² and sacrifice was offered to him. (Gen. xvi. 7; xviii.;³ xxxi. 11, Ex. xxiii. 20; xxxii. 34; xxxiii. 2; Numb. xx. 16; Judges ii. 1.)

Far less frequently the appearances of hostile spirits were referred to Jehovah. The most striking instance is in Ex. iv. 24; others occur in Ex. xii. 23; Numb. xxii. 22; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xix. 35.

The Israelites believed that dreams were sent by Jehovah. (Gen. xxvi. 2; xxviii. 11-13; xxxi. 11; xli. 2; 1 Sam. iii. 3; 1 Kings iii. 5.) From this belief arose the idea, common to many ancient nations, that the divinity preferred to appear by night and departed before morning. (Gen. xxxii. 26.) In common, too, with the rest of antiquity, Israel believed that Jehovah sometimes made known the future to his worshippers, especially when approached with prescribed forms. (Gen. xxiv. 12-14; xxvii. 20; Judges vi. 36-40; Gen. xxv. 22; xli. 5; 1 Kings xx. 33.)

Ancient Israel did not imagine that Jehovah dwelt in heaven.⁴ The earliest belief was, that he dwelt at Sinai or Horeb, which was probably the ancient seat of his worship. (Judges v. 4; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ex. iii. 1; 1 Kings xix. 4.) When Canaan was conquered, he was naturally supposed, as god of the land, to dwell there (Hos. viii. 1; ix. 3, 15; Ex. xv. 17; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Gen. iv. 14), especially in the sanctuaries which had been

¹ Especially spirits in the form of goats. The ceremonies connected with the scape-goat may be a relic of these. Compare Isa. xlii. 21; xxxiv. 14; Lev. xvii. 7.

² See on the other hand Judges xiii. 16, which may, however, and also verse 19, be an interpolation from a rationalistic point of view.

³ The "three" men are a late addition.

⁴ The first intimation of this is in Gen. xxviii. (E).

taken from the Canaanites and devoted to his worship.¹ As these sanctuaries had been consecrated to different gods, it followed that a distinction arose between the gods of these places, each of whom was supposed to be Jehovah.² (Judges vi. 24; Amos viii. 14; Gen. xvi. 13; xxxi. 13.) The latest belief was, that he dwelt in the temple at Jerusalem (1 Kings viii. 10; Ezek. xliii. 7), a belief connected with that ancient one of fetish origin, that he inhabited the ark. (1 Sam. iv. 3; vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi.)

Every Israelite village of any importance had a place of worship dedicated to Jehovah, the *dama*, as it was called, situated either on a hill or under a tree. The larger sanctuaries were built near some striking natural object, such as a mountain, a spring, or a rock.

In common with the rest of antiquity, Israel regarded mountains as favourite abodes of the divinity (Gen. xxii. 14; Numb. xxiii. 3; Deut. xxxiii. 19; 2 Sam. xv. 32; 1 Kings xi. 7; xviii. 19; xx. 23),³ probably because they were frequently covered with clouds.

Holy trees were found at Hebron (Gen. xiii. 18; xviii. 1), Shechem (Gen. xii. 6; xxxv. 4; Josh. xxiv. 26; Judges ix. 6, 37), Ophrah (Judges vi. 11, 19), and at Beersheba⁴ (Gen. xxi. 33). These were always ever-green trees, as being the best symbols of life; "green" is the constant adjective applied to them by the prophets.⁵ The name used for them—*ela* or *elon*—shows that they were considered to be divine beings. Their sanctity is further displayed by kings sitting under them to give judgment (Judges iv. 5; 1 Sam. xiv. 2; xxii. 6), and wise men to utter oracles,⁶ and by the people assembling at them on important occasions. (Josh. xxiv. 26; Judges ix. 6; 1 Kings xii. 1.)

There were holy wells at Kadesh (Numb. xxvii. 14), Beer-lahai-roi (Gen. xvi. 14; xxiv. 62; xxv. 11), and probably at Zion (Ezek. xlvii. 1; Joel iii. 18). The name of the well in Nehem. ii. 13, shows that spirits were believed to dwell in the springs.

Holy stones existed at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxv. 14), Ophrah (Judges vi. 20), Zion (2 Sam. xxiv. 16), Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 26), Gilead (Gen. xxxi. 45), Gilgal (Josh. iv.; compare Judges iii. 19, 26), and other places.⁷

¹ Ex. xx. 24. The expressions used for sacrifice and consulting the oracle, e.g. seeking Jehovah, approaching him, seeing his face, as well as the cities of refuge, which could only have possessed their rights as sanctuaries of Jehovah, clearly prove this.

² The Priestly Codex harmonizes these ideas with the unity of Jehovah by deriving the sanctity of these places from the belief, not that Jehovah dwelt there, but that he had appeared there. (Gen. xviii. 1; xvi. 24; xxviii. 1; Judges vi. 1; 2 Sam. xxiv.)

³ Compare too the prophetic denunciation of the popular worship, e.g. Hos. iv. 13; Jer. ii. 20; iii. 6, 23; xvii. 2; Ez. vi. 13; xviii. 6, 15; Is. lvii. 7; lvi. 7; 1 Kings xiv. 23; and the expression "the Baal of Peor" (Numb. xxv. 3 marg. of R.V.).

⁴ Though the real object of worship was the spring (Gen. xxvi. 33).

⁵ See many of the passages quoted in note (3).

⁶ As shown by the expressions *elon mora* and *elon meonenim* (Gen. xii. 6; Deut. xi. 30; Jud. ix. 37; R.V.).

⁷ See Josh. xv. 16; xviii. 17; xxii. 1; 1 Sam. vi. 14, 15; vii. 12; 2 Sam. xx. 8; 1 Kings i. 9. See Kuenen i. 394, 395, and Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites," chapters 3, 4, and 5.

The ark, too, probably contained a meteoric stone, which, as it fell from heaven, was regarded as the abode of Jehovah.¹

Since we find the graves of the ancestors of Israel situated on mountains,² or connected with places where there stood either a tree or a stone,³ it is impossible to avoid the conclusion to which we are led by many other considerations that the pre-Jehovistic worship was that of ancestors.⁴

From the worship of holy stones and trees arose the *masseba*, or holy pillars, and the *aschera*, or holy poles.⁵

With the Israelites these pillars were not hewn into any form, and were not, therefore, as with other nations, gradually transformed into images. That they were necessary adjuncts to divine worship, is proved by the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiv. 4) narrating that Moses erected twelve at Sinai and by Hosea (iii. 4; x. 2), and Isaiah (xix. 19) considering them as indispensable as the altars themselves.

The sacred poles were probably originated by worshippers of tree deities who were forced to live in places where the special tree, which was the object of their veneration, did not grow. The *aschera* were confounded as early as the time of the Deuteronomic writers with Astarte; but the expressions "plant" and "hew down," used with respect to them, and a comparison with the religious customs of other ancient nations, show clearly what they really were. They are mentioned as standing by the altar of Jehovah in 2 Kings xiii. 6; xviii. 4; xxi. 7; xxiii. 6, 15; (R.V.) compare also Ex. xxxiv. 13; Deut. vii. 5; xii. 3; xvi. 21.

Since natural objects were regarded as the abodes of deity, there was little need of temples; an altar built in the simplest way of unhewn stones near the sacred tree or spring was enough. In later times altars of brass came into use in the temple at Jerusalem; but they are tacitly condemned in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 24, 25). That the use of these was a foreign custom is clear from 2 Kings xvi. 10, 11.

Another religious usage, which was introduced into Israel from without,⁶ was the worship of Jehovah in the form of a bull, a relic of totemism. It chiefly prevailed in the northern kingdom,⁷ in Jerusalem the ark took its

¹ See 2 Sam. xv. 25, etc. Probably we should read in Gen. xlix. 24 "the shepherd of the stone of Israel," the reference would be to Bethel or Gilead.

² Numb. xx. 28; Josh. xxiv. 30.

³ Gen. xxiii. 17; xxv. 8, 20; Numb. xx. 1; Josh. xxiv. 32.

⁴ It is easy to understand the legend that Moses, the founder of the worship which swept away the cult of ancestors, was buried in an unknown grave.

Perhaps in Gen. xxxv. 4 we have a trace of the transference from one worship to the other. Compare Josh. xxiv. 26.

⁵ The popular idea of these was doubtless that condemned in Jer. ii. 27.

⁶ The Phœnicians worshipped Baal in the form of a bull. The wild bull did not exist in the neighbourhood of Palestine, nor could the Israelites have kept them in their nomad state from lack of water. The bull presupposes agriculture and a settled condition.

⁷ Bull images existed in Samaria, Bethel and Dan (1 Kings xii. 28; 2 Kings x. 29; Hos. viii. 5, 6; x. 5).

place; its condemnation lies at the foundation of the narrative of Ex. xxxii. A wider development of totemism is mentioned in Ezek. viii. 10, though the passage is of too late a date to draw any decided conclusions from it with respect to the religious observances of ancient Israel. The command of Ex. xx. 4 was directed against such practices.¹

Other idols of which we read in the Old Testament are the ephod, the brazen serpent, and the teraphim. Of these, the first, from its derivation, seems to have been an image of wood, plated with precious metal. There was one in the sanctuary of Micah (Judges xvii. 5), others at Ophrah (Judges viii. 27) and Nob (1 Sam. xxi. 9). We read of the brazen serpent in 2 Kings xviii. 4, but know nothing of its cult; ² the story in Numbers xxi. is an attempt to bring it into connection with the religion of Jehovah. The teraphim, used, apparently, like the ephod, as oracles,³ may have been images of ancestors, as they were of the size and shape of a man;⁴ but we have no certain information about them, and the etymology of the word is unknown.

The belief that certain men were possessed by the deity was held by Israel as by all ancient nations. These men, called "nebiim," or prophets were from the first in the service of the worship of Jehovah; he was their God, and they were zealous for his honour. They were therefore an important factor in the religious development of Israel, since they clung fast to the idea of Moses, that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel and resisted every tendency to a polytheistic worship.

Jehovah, like the gods of other nations, had his priests. The duty of these was in early times not so much to sacrifice,⁵ for every head of a family could do this, as to take care of the sancinaries and consult the oracles contained in them. The oracle was called Urim and Thummim, and consisted of two lots,⁶ by means of which one could get the answer yes or no. These were kept in the ephod, either the priestly garment or the image of that name. The answer of the oracle was called *torah*,⁷ i.e., a throw; this word was afterwards used of every instruction given by priest or prophet. In later days all priests claimed descent from Moses.

The Nazarites were one of a class common to all animistic religions, who attempt to gain the favour of their god by abstaining from certain acts. From the story of Samson and Amos ii. 11, 12, we see that they abstained from drinking wine and cutting their hair, i.e., they avoided all connection with the cult of ancestors.⁸

¹ "Anything that is in heaven above," refers to birds, not to angels.

² Robertson Smith, in "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," argues from 2 Sam. xvii. 25, that the serpent was the totem of David's family.

³ Ezek. xxi. 21; Hos. iii. 4.

⁴ 1 Sam. xix. 13. The theory that they were images of ancestors is supported by Gen. xxxi. 19 (R.V.).

⁵ Compare Deut. xxxiii. 8-10.

⁶ Perhaps two little teraphim. See note (3) above.

⁷ Stade. See, however, Kuenen's *Hexateuch*, 177.

⁸ Compare Numb. vi. 6-12.

The only other ministers of Jehovah were slaves, generally captured in war, who were employed at the temple at Jerusalem in menial duties,¹ and the men and women who served their god with acts of unchastity.² This latter form of worship was doubtless borrowed from the religious observances of the Canaanites.

To approach Jehovah in worship, it was necessary to be clean, that is, to be unpolluted by the worship of any other god. If a man was polluted by this worship, he was said to be unclean (*Jer. ii. 7, 23*). In some cases the uncleanness was contagious, and thus separated a man from the company of his fellows.³ Palestine was the holy land, because in it sacrifice was made to Jehovah, every other country was unclean because there Jehovah could not be worshipped.⁴ The Israelite who left his country, was obliged to eat unclean food (*Hos. ix. 3, 4; Ez. iv. 13*); if he died in a foreign land, he died on unclean earth (*Amos vii. 17*).

Many of the religious laws of the Israelites become clear when we recognise the basis on which the distinction of clean and unclean rests. Others (mentioned in *2 Kings vii. 3; Lev. xii. and xv. ; 1 Sam. xxi. 4; 2 Sam. xi. 4*) are to be explained by the belief that certain sicknesses were caused by the possession of spirits, and that certain acts put men in the power of these spirits. The law of *Lev. xvii. 10-16* is explained by the belief that the blood was the life;⁵ *Ex. xxiii. 19*, by the fact that such milk was used in superstitious lustrations of the fields.

The laws of clean and unclean food depended on some animals being connected with other worship than that of Jehovah,⁶ on others being the totem of different tribes, for no family eat the animal which was its totem, for fear of devouring an ancestor unawares. The large number of unclean animals was owing to the circumstance that Israel, on becoming a nation, adopted, as a whole, the customs of its constituent tribes.⁷

Like every other nation, both ancient and modern, the Israelites attempted to get a favourable answer to prayer from their God, by promising him some offering if their prayer were heard. The most curious instance of this is the vow which they were accustomed to make in time of war, viz., that they would destroy all the inhabitants of the town which they were attacking, and the town itself, as a sacrifice to Jehovah, if only

¹ *Ezra viii. 17-20; Josh. ix. 27; Ezek. xlv. 8.*

² *Deut. xxiii. 18; Gen. xxxviii.; Ezek. xx. 30.*

³ *1 Sam. xx. 26.*

⁴ *Hos. iii. 4; Ex. viii. 26; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.*

⁵ *2 Sam. xxiii. 17.*

⁶ Swine were sacred animals in many countries; serpents were everywhere regarded as the incarnation of spirits.

⁷ This was not, however, universally the case. Compare *Deut. xiv. 19* with *Lev. xi. 21*. It is curious that at the present day some Arabian tribes eat these animals, while others do not.

he would give it into their hands.¹ This vow was afterwards limited by the Deuteronomic law (Deut. xx. 13, 14).

Blessings and curses were frequent in the mouths of the Israelites. The importance attached to a father's blessing before his death, and the great fear caused by a curse (Judges xvii. 2), were relics of the old cult of ancestors, and the belief that certain people were able to invoke the aid of spirits to work their will.

Sacrifice, as the oldest word for it, *minha*, shows, was a gift to the deity, either to gain his favour or to display gratitude for its having been given.² The usual offering was food, which to an uncivilized people was the most valued treasure it could give. From the custom of offering food sprang the conception of a sacrificial meal, the sharing one's food with Jehovah.³ Since flesh was an uncommon luxury, every slaughter of an animal for food was connected with sacrifice.

Sacrifice was rarely offered to appease Jehovah's wrath,⁴ for no one would dare to approach him till his anger had ceased.⁵ Only his favoured servants would venture into his presence under such circumstances, and hence arose the custom of sacrifice by the hands of a priest.

We read very seldom of human sacrifice⁶ except in the form mentioned in 1 Sam. xv. The laws relating to the firstborn prove that the Israelites were free in the old time from the Canaanite custom of sacrificing their children.⁷

The Israelite festivals were either lunar feasts⁸ or thanksgivings for the increase of fields and herds. In the former category stood the new moon and sabbath, days on which there was cessation of ordinary business.⁹ On the new moon the common sacrifice of the family seems to have been offered.¹⁰ In the second category stood the three great festivals of unleavened bread, of weeks, and of tabernacles. The first was the feast to celebrate the beginning of the harvest,¹¹ as is incidentally divulged in Deut. xvi. 9, and by the fact that a sheaf of barley, the first ripe corn, was offered; the second to celebrate its close; the third to celebrate the

¹ Compare Keunen i. 290, 291. Wellhausen, from an incidental remark on p. 260, seems to throw doubt on the custom. See also Judges ix. 45; Josh. vi. 21, 26.

² Ex. xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 20; Deut. xvi. 16.

³ A far better theory is discussed at length in Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites."

⁴ 1 Sam. iii. 14; xxvi. 19.

⁵ 2 Sam. xxiv. 18-25.

⁶ Judges xi. 31.

⁷ 2 Kings iii. 27. Perhaps Gen. xxii. is a proof that the custom lingered on in Hebron and Shechem, parts of Palestine which were the last to come under Israelite dominion.

⁸ Up to the present day the moon is thought to have great influence on life, whether of plant, beast, or man.

⁹ 2 Kings iv. 23; Amos viii. 5. This custom presupposes an agricultural life, and was probably borrowed from a foreign nation.

¹⁰ 1 Sam. xx. 6, 24, 29.

¹¹ Unleavened bread was eaten at this feast, partly because it was quickest prepared, partly because yeast would connect it with last year's harvest and so deprive it of its character of first-fruits.

ingathering of oil and wine. With the feast of unleavened bread coincided the feast on which the firstlings of flocks and herds were offered.¹ This latter seems to have been a lunar feast, and was of course much older than the former, which presupposes an agricultural life.

In ancient times it was customary to visit one of the great sanctuaries at the time of the feast of the vintage.² This may also have been the case with the other festivals; but we read nothing of these in the historical books, and it is obvious that the last feast in the year gave the best opportunity for a holiday. Such pilgrimages were of great value in driving home to the hearts of the people the belief that they were one nation, and it was perhaps at such gatherings that the scattered local legends were woven into the one connected story of the patriarchs, so that the tribe of Ephraim no longer claimed descent merely from Jacob, and Judah from Isaac and Abraham, but all the tribes united in owning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as their ancestors.

The morality of Israel was like that of other ancient nations,³ though in some respects it may have been a little superior. An Israelite's duty, however, lay only towards his fellow-countrymen, the foreigner had no rights.⁴

The idea of sin, too, was that common to antiquity. There was no difference between a deliberate breaking of Jehovah's law and an unconscious deviation from it (1 Sam. xiv.). Since the divine relationship was not between the individual and God, but between Israel and Jehovah, it followed that one man's sin might bring punishment on the whole nation,⁵ though even in early days this was felt to be hardly right;⁶ and on the other hand the divine wrath against the nation was expiated by the punishment of individuals.⁷

¹ "The elaboration of the historical motive of the passover is not earlier than Deuteronomy. . . . What has led to it is evidently the coincidence of the spring festival with the exodus, already accepted by the older tradition, the relation of cause and effect having become inverted in course of time." Wellhausen, 88.

² 1 Sam. i. 3; 1 Kings xii. 32.

³ Immorality, for example, meets with no reproof (Gen. xxxviii.; Judges xvi.), except with another man's wife (Gen. xxxix. 9).

⁴ Deut. xxiii. 19, 20. Jehovah protects Abraham and Isaac after they have told lies, and punishes the innocent foreigner. Gen. xii., xx., and xxvi.

⁵ Gen. xii. 17; xx. 9; xxvi. 10; 1 Sam. xiv. 38; 2 Sam. xxi. 1; xxiv. 13. Compare 1 Kings xvii. 20.

⁶ 2 Sam. xxiv. 17; Gen. xviii. 23.

⁷ Numb. xxv. 3, 4; 2 Sam. xxi. 6; Ex. xxxii. 27.

CONFUCIUS THE SAGE, AND THE RELIGION OF CHINA.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES LEGGE.

THE subject which I have undertaken to bring before you is, you perceive, twofold: Confucius the Sage, and the Religion of China. I purposely worded it so. Two errors are frequently fallen into about Confucius. Some writers represent him as the author of what I may call the State religion of his country; while others contend that his teaching is merely a system of morality, without the element of religion. I have thought it would be well if I constructed my lecture this afternoon so as to correct both those errors, and give you, so far as the time will permit, some information as to who and what Confucius was, and what was the nature of that religion which was his by inheritance. We shall thus see how the two errors about him have arisen, be able to form an opinion as to the service which he did for China and the world, and also to pass a judgment as to the religious beliefs and practices which have obtained among the Chinese people from time immemorial.

First, then, let me speak to you of Confucius, giving you a brief sketch of his history, character, and teachings, without bringing in the subject of religion. I need hardly tell you that the name Confucius is merely the Latinized form of the three Chinese words K'ung Fû-tsze (孔夫子), meaning "The Master K'ung," equivalent, in the mouths of his disciples, to "Our Master K'ung," and accepted generally as the denomination of him as the most distinguished, or among the most distinguished, of all human teachers. He was emphatically a teacher. He was not a hero, whose history can be made interesting by a record of his military prowess, nor a man of science, who enlarged the boundaries of knowledge and opened the way to new triumphs of man over nature. He was the sage, the man of calm and practical wisdom, inspired by the love of mankind, and inculcating the lessons of human duty.

His surname, as I have just intimated, was K'ung; and his birth took place in the year B.C. 551, in what was then the feudal State of Lâ, a portion of what is now the province of Shan-tung, on the eastern seaboard of China. But though he was born in Lâ, his family had migrated thither from the duchy of Sung, in the present province of Ho-nan. The K'ung clan was a branch of the ducal House of Sung, which itself was descended from the kings of the dynasty of Shang, who had ruled from B.C. 1766 to 1123, and who traced their lineage back to Hwang Tî, the first year of whose reign is said to have been in B.C. 2697. There are tens of thousands

of K'ungs now living, who boast of being descended from Confucius, and who have thus an ancestry going back into the mists of antiquity more than four thousand five hundred years ago. Between the K'ungs and another more powerful clan of Sung there was an hereditary enmity; and the great-grandfather of our subject fled in consequence to the marquissate of Lû, and settled there. Confucius' father, called Shû-liang Hih, is known to us as sustaining an honourable position, and an officer of extraordinary strength and bravery. We are told that, in the year B.C. 562, when serving at the siege of a place called Pih-yang, a party of the assailants made their way in at a gate which had purposely been left open, and that no sooner were they inside than the portcullis was dropped. Hih was entering with the others; but, catching the massive structure with both his hands he gradually by his great strength raised it, and held it up till all his friends had turned and made their escape out. In his old age, for reasons into a detail of which I need not go, he divorced his wife, and contracted a second marriage with a young lady of the family of Yen, of whom Confucius was born in B.C. 551, as I have said.

The old father died soon afterwards, when the boy was in his third year; and his mother and he were left in straitened circumstances. The lad developed early the tendencies of his character. He has left us a very brief account of his mental growth, saying that at fifteen his mind was set on learning, and that at seventy he could do whatever his heart prompted, confident that it was right. When his mother died, in his twenty-third or twenty-fourth year, he raised the coffin in which, probably on account of her poverty, she had buried her husband near the place where they lived, and took it and her coffin to the place in which the K'ungs had first found refuge in Lû, and laid them there in the same grave. Before his mother's death he had married himself; and he appears to have lived with his wife happily enough for about fifty years. There is no sufficient evidence that he divorced her, as has been alleged, or ever introduced a concubine into his family. So far as his own practice is concerned, Confucius was a monogamist. His children were not many. He had one son, merely an ordinary, average man, but who left a son superior to himself, and to whom we are indebted for the most complete and philosophical account of his grandfather's teachings. Mention is made, in the Confucian Analects, Book V., of a daughter, whom he married to an officer that had been imprisoned under a false charge, but of whose worthiness Confucius was convinced; and in a smaller cemetery adjoining that where he, his son, and grandson were buried, there is the grave of another daughter, who died when she was quite young. These appear to have been all his children. Probably in his twenty-second year Confucius commenced his labours as a teacher in his native village. But he was not what we call a schoolmaster, teaching boys the rudiments of education. His house was the resort of young and inquiring spirits, whose attention he directed to the ancient monuments of the nation's history and literature, unfolding to them at the same

time the principles of human duty and of government. This was the work of his life, for he neither wrote nor instituted much himself. His first biographer, the historian Sze-ma Ch'ien, says that "he wrote a Preface to the Book of History; carefully digested the Rites and Ceremonies determined by the wisdom of the ancient Sages and Kings; collected and arranged the ancient Poems; and undertook the reform of Music." But Confucius's labours on the ancient writings appear to have been slight, and there is no reliable ground for supposing that he either added to or took from the Books of History and Rites, which had come down to his time. The only work which he claimed as his own was the "Chronicle of the Spring and Autumn," which can only be considered a meagre compilation, and would have little interest but for the three Supplements to it by other hands which have also been preserved. Perhaps he made some alterations in the Book of Poetry, for he says himself, "I returned from Wei to Lû, and then the music was reformed; and the pieces in the Imperial Songs and Praise Songs found all their proper place."

His disciples, first and last, amounted, it is said, to three thousand; and among them there were between seventy and eighty whom he highly valued, and praised as "scholars of extraordinary ability." From the time that he thus comes before us on the stage of public life, and especially during the long period of wandering among different States that subsequently befell him, he always appears attended by companies of his disciples. These must have supported him. In his earlier school he received all who came to him for instruction, and did not refuse the smallest fee; but he required from all an ardent desire for improvement and a good measure of capacity. It is difficult for us, however, to understand this feature of his course:—how, while dependent on the sympathy and support of his followers, he yet maintained among them the most entire authority and independence. When Mencius, who is styled "the secondary Sage," came after him, about a century and a half later, and went about the country in the same way, enforcing the lessons of "the Master," he accepted the gifts of different princes to an extent that startled even his disciples. But Confucius never did so. He would not demean himself to receive help from a ruler whom he disapproved, and who would not carry out his principles in the government of his people. Confucius must have been supported by the free-will contributions of his disciples. This point in the study of his course has often suggested to me the passage in the Gospel of Luke where it says (chap. viii. 1-3) that Jesus "went about through cities and villages, preaching the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with Him the twelve and certain women that had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities:—Mary Magdalene and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered to them of their substance."

A noble by descent, and soon widely known for his attainments, Confucius might have expected to be called to a position in the government of the State. But the time was one of great corruption and disorder. The

no apprehension. "The mountain falling came to nought, and the rock was removed out of its place. So death prevailed against him, and he passed. His countenance was changed, and he was sent away."

I have thus given a very condensed outline of the events of Confucius' life. Of his personal appearance, his habits, and his sayings we have abundant details in the records of his disciples. He was tall, and methodical, doing everything in the proper way, time, and place. He was nice in his eating, but not a great eater. He was not a total abstainer from spirituous drink, but he never took too much. To confine myself to what they tell us of him as a teacher:—They found him free from foregone conclusions, arbitrary determinations, obstinacy, and egoism; he would not talk with them about extraordinary things, feats of strength, rebellious disorder, and spiritual beings; he frequently discoursed to them about the Books of Poetry and History and the Rules of Propriety; there were three things, he said, in which the greatest caution was required,—fasting (as preparatory to sacrifice), going to war, and the treatment of disease; he insisted on their cultivating letters, ethics, real-heartedness, and truthfulness; and there were three things on which he seldom dwelt,—the profitable, the decrees of Heaven, and perfect virtue.

He held that society was made up of five relationships,—those of husband and wife, of parent and child, of elder and younger brother, or generally of elders and younger, of ruler and minister or subject, and of friend and friend. A country would be well governed when all the parties in those relationships performed their parts aright; though I must think that he allowed too much to the authority of the higher party in each of them. I do not mean to say that there was no such moral teaching in the literature of China before his time. There was much, but he invested it all with a new grace and dignity. His greatest achievement, however, in his moral teaching was his inculcation of the Golden Rule, which he delivered at least five separate times. Tsze-kung once asked him whether there were any one word which might serve as a rule of practice for all one's life. His reply was, "Is there not *shü* (恕)?" that is, *reciprocity*, or *altruism*; and he added the explanation of it:—"What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others. The same disciple on another occasion saying that he observed the rule, Confucius simply remarked, "Ah! you have not attained to that!" He tells us, indeed, in one important passage—and we do not think the worse of him for the acknowledgment—that he was not able himself to follow the rule in its positive form in any one of the relationships.

Many of his short sayings are admirable in their pith and sagacity. What could be better than these?—

"Learning without thought is labour lost; thought without learning is perilous."

"It is only the truly virtuous who can love or hate others."

"Can there be love which does not lead to strictness in the training of

its object? Can there be loyalty which does not lead to the instruction of its object?"

"To be poor without murmuring is difficult; to be rich without being proud is easy."

Some of his sayings, indeed, are somewhat enigmatical. For instance, "Let a good man teach the people seven years, and they may then likewise be employed in war"; and again, "To lead an uninstructed people to war is to throw them away." But from these commentators deduce the lesson that when a people are well trained in a knowledge of all their duties, they will be prepared to die for their country and king. The more educated the lower classes of a people are, however, the less likely are they to allow themselves to be led by their superiors to the battlefield.

There was nothing he liked to set forth so much as the character of his superior or ideal man. Take a few of his deliverances on this subject:—"The superior man is catholic, and not a partisan." "He does what is proper to the position in which he is; he does not desire to go beyond it. He finds himself in no position in which he is not himself." I will give you one more specimen, and only one; "The scholar considers leal-heartedness and good faith to be his coat of mail and helmet, propriety and righteousness to be his shield and buckler; he walks along, bearing over his head benevolence; he dwells holding righteousness in his arms before him; the government may be violently oppressive, but he does not change his course: such is the way in which he maintains himself."

It may occur to you that, notwithstanding all I have said, Confucius does not appear to you in any other character but as an ethical teacher of great merit; but I did not wish in this part of the lecture to exhibit him in any other. Wherein we must attach to his teachings a religious sanction will be seen in the other part, to which I will immediately proceed.

Certain failures in his character and writings, moreover, have been pointed out, and by no one so much as myself. He enunciated, for instance, as we have seen, the Golden Rule; but he did not, or would not, appreciate the still higher rule, when his attention was called to it, that good should be returned for injury or evil, and that the evil will thereby be overcome. This loftiest of all maxims was enunciated by Lâotsze, and when submitted to Confucius, his judgment on it was, "With what then will you recompense good or kindness? Recompense injury with justice, and kindness with kindness." And when the subject subsequently came before him in his intercourse with his disciples, he never advanced beyond that deliverance. Again, while Confucius taught truthfulness, there are many passages in the *Spring and Autumn*, which he claimed especially as his own work, that awaken doubts as to its historical veracity. But, after all, these charges are not very heavy, and he would have recked little of them himself. When he was once charged with slighting an important rule of propriety, all that he said in reply was, "I

am fortunate. If I have any errors, people are sure to know them." You will not be sorry to hear the magnificent eulogium which his grandson pronounced on the ideal sage and king, being understood to have had Confucius in his mind :—

"Possessed of all sagely qualities, showing himself quick in apprehension, clear in discernment, of far-reaching intelligence and all-embracing knowledge, he was fitted to exercise rule; magnanimous, generous, benign, and mild, fitted to exercise forbearance; impulsive, energetic, firm, and enduring, fitted to maintain a strong hold; self-adjusted, grave, never swerving from the Mean and correct, fitted to command reverence; accomplished, distinctive, concentrative, and searching, fitted to exercise discrimination. Therefore his fame overspreads the Middle Kingdom, and extends to all barbarous tribes. Wherever ships and carriages reach, wherever the strength of man penetrates, wherever the heaven overshadows and the earth sustains, wherever the sun and moon shine, wherever frosts and dews fall, all who have blood and breath unfeignedly honour and love him."

Secondly, let me pass on now to consider what is the nature of the religion of China—what it was in the very earliest times, and what it continues substantially to be at the present day. As we succeed in the study and exhibition of this, we shall discover more clearly the deep foundation of the moral teaching of Confucius, and wherein the religion itself fails to supply to the Chinese people all that is necessary for the nourishment of their spiritual being and the making of them what they ought to be.

There have been from time immemorial two sacrificial services in China, —one addressed to the Supreme Being, and the other to the spirits of the dead. I call them *sacrificial* services in accordance with the general usage of writers on the subject; but we must not import into the words *sacrifice* and *sacrificial* all the ideas which we attach to them. The most common term for *sacrifice* in Chinese is *tsi* (祭), and the most general idea symbolized by it is an offering whereby communication and communion with spiritual beings are effected. The offerings, we are told, and the language employed in presenting them, were for the purpose of prayer, or of thanksgiving, or of deprecation. Our meaning of substitution and propitiation does not enter into the term, excepting in the sense of making propitious and friendly.

I will speak first of the former service.

The earliest name for the Supreme Being among the Chinese fathers appears to have been *T'ien*, or "Heaven." When the framers of their characters made one to denote "Heaven" (天), they fashioned it from two already existing characters, representing "one" (一) and "great" (大), signifying the vast and bright firmament, overspreading and embracing all, and from which came the light, heat, and rain which rendered the earth beneath fruitful and available for the support and dwelling of man and all other living beings on its surface. But their minds did not rest in the material, or I might almost say the immaterial sky. The name soon

became symbolical to them of a Power and Ruler, a spiritual Being, whom they denominated *Ti* (帝), "God," and *Shang Ti* (上帝), "the supreme God." I cannot render these terms in English in any other way. The Chinese dictionaries tell us that *Ti* represents the ideas of lordship and rule.

So it was that the name for the *sky* which they beheld became to the earliest Chinese personal as the denomination of their concept of God. The same process of thought must have taken place among our own early Fathers, though the personal name has displaced the material and symbolical term among us much more than it has among the Chinese. The name *Heaven* for *God*, however, has not altogether disappeared from our common speech. Witness such phrases as "Heaven knows," "Please Heaven." I find the same significance in the words of Daniel to the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou shalt know that the Heavens do rule"; and in the penitent language of the returning prodigal, "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and in thy sight."

The worship of God was associated with a worship of the more prominent objects of nature, such as heaven and earth, the sun and moon, the starry host, hills and streams, forests and valleys. It has been contended from this that the most ancient religion of the Chinese was a worship of the objects of nature. I do not think it was so, and I am supported in my opinion by the express testimony of Confucius, that "by the ceremonies of the sacrifices to heaven and earth they served God." These words supply an instance of his unfrequent use of the personal name, which he employed, I suppose, to give greater emphasis to his declaration. If it was so in the worship of those greatest objects of nature, much more must it have been so in that of the inferior objects. Even though the presidency of those objects may be ignorantly and superstitiously assigned to different spiritual Beings, the prayers to them show that the worship of them is still a service of God. In a prayer, for instance, to the Cloud-master, the Rain-master, the Lord of the Winds, and the Thunder-master, it is said, "It is yours, O Spirits, to superintend the clouds and the rain, and to raise and send abroad the winds, as ministers assisting the supreme God." To the spirits of all the hills and rivers under the sky, again, it is said, "It is yours, O Spirits, with your Heaven-conferred powers and nurturing influences, each to preside over one district, as ministers assisting the Great Worker and Transformer."

Thus then I may affirm that the religion of China was, and is, a monotheism, disfigured indeed by ignorance and superstition, but still a monotheism, based on the belief in one Supreme Being, of Whom, and through Whom, and to Whom are all things.

Very soon that religion became a State-worship, and in doing so it took a peculiar form. The only performer allowed in it is "the One man," the sovereign of the nation himself. Its celebration, moreover, is limited to a few occasions, the greatest being that at the winter solstice. Then the service is, or ought to be, an acknowledgment by the Emperor, for him-

self, his line, and the people, of their obligations to God. It is said of this ceremony, that it is "the utmost expression of reverence" and "the greatest act of thanksgiving." It may have degenerated into a mere formality, but there is the original idea underlying it. It grew probably from the earliest patriarchal worship, though there is no record of that in Chinese literature. The sovereign stands forth in it, both the father and priest of his people. I do not term him the *high*-priest, for there is no other priest in all the empire. No one is allowed in the same 'direct' manner to sacrifice to God. There never has been in China a priestly class or caste, and I cannot consider this a disadvantage. The restriction of the direct, solemn worship of God to the Emperor has been unfortunate, excluding the people generally from that communion with Him which is the highest privilege of man and the most conducive to the beauty and excellence of his whole character; but better this even than a priestly class, claiming to stand between men and God, themselves not better than other men, and in no respect more highly gifted, and yet shutting up the way into the holiest that is open to all, and assuming to be able by rites and performances of theirs to dispense blessings which can only be obtained from the great God with Whom all have to do.

Only on one other point in this part of my lecture will I touch; the relation between men and God as their Governor and the connection between the religion and morality. King T'ang, the founder of the Shang dynasty in B.C. 1766, thus spoke:—"The great God has conferred even on the inferior people a moral sense, compliance with which would show their nature invariably right. To make them tranquilly pursue the course which it would indicate is the work of the sovereign." Much to the same effect spoke Wû, the first king of the Ch'au dynasty, in B.C. 1122:—"He even, to help the inferior people, made for them rulers, and made for them instructors, who should be assisting to God, so as to secure tranquillity throughout the nation." Thus government is from God and teaching is from God. They are both divine ordinances. The king and the sage are equally God's ministers, having their respective functions; and they have no other divine right to their positions but that which arises from the fulfilment of their duties. The dynasty that does not rule so as to secure the well-being of the people has forfeited its right to the throne. An old poet, celebrating the rise of the dynasty of which he was a scion, thus sang:—

"Oh! great is God; His glance on earth He bent,
Scanning our regions with severe intent
For one whose rule the people should content.
"The earlier lines of kings had practised ill,
And ruling, ruled not after God's just will;
He therefore 'mong the States was searching still."

So it was with the sovereign; and as for the teacher, if he did not set forth aright the will of God, he had no function at all.

See the application of all this to the case of Confucius and the religious character which it imparts to his moral teachings. The treatise of his

grandson, to which I have already alluded, commences with this sentence:—"What HEAVEN has conferred" (on man) "is called his NATURE; an accordance with this nature is called the PATH" (of DUTY); "the regulation of this path is called the SYSTEM OF INSTRUCTION." Now who ever sought to regulate the path of duty by his instructions as our sage did? In doing so, he taught man indeed to act in accordance with his nature; but accordance with that nature was the fulfilment of the will of Heaven. The idea of Heaven or God as man's Maker and Governor was fundamental to the teachings of Confucius; and on this account I contend that those who see in him only a moral teacher do not understand him. What he said was with a divine sanction; and they who neglected and disobeyed his lessons were, as he said, "offending against Heaven, and had none to whom they could pray."

And further, the account which I have given of the State religion supplies probably the true reason why Confucius generally spoke of Heaven, and seldom used the personal name *God*. We ought to find the expressions of a devout reverence and submission in such utterances as the following:—"Alas! there is no one that knows me. But I do not murmur against Heaven, nor grumble against men. 'There is Heaven' That knows me."

But I hasten on to speak, next and finally, of that other worship—if we should call it so—the sacrifices to ancestors and to others not of the same line as their worshippers.

How this worship took its rise, I am unable to say. Herbert Spencer holds that "the rudimentary form of all religion is the propitiation of dead ancestors who are supposed to be still existing, and to be capable of working good or evil to their descendants." This view is open to the criticism which I made on the Confucian sacrifices generally,—that our idea of propitiation is not in them. It is not found either in those to the supreme Being or in those to the dead.

Of course sacrificing to the dead involves a belief in the continued existence of the souls or spirits of men after their life on earth has come to a close, and also that they continue in the possession of their higher faculties, so as to be conscious of the services rendered to them, and to be able to exercise an influence on the condition of their descendants and others in the world.

Sacrificing to the departed great, who were not of the same line as their worshippers, admits of an easy explanation. It is a grateful recognition of the services which they rendered to their own times and for all time. In the *Record of Ritual Usages* we read, "According to the Institutes of the Sage Kings, sacrifices should be offered to him who had given laws to the people, to him who had persevered to the death in the discharge of his duties, to him who had strengthened the State by his laborious toil, to him who had boldly and successfully met great calamities, and to him who had warded off great evils. Only men of this character were admitted to the

sacrificial canon." Such a sacrificial service has little that is objectionable in it. It is little more than the tribute which an historian pays to the virtues of those whom he commemorates in his writings, and in which his readers cordially join. Nor does this worship interfere with the monotheism of the Chinese religion. The men are not deified. I will give you an instance in point from a hymn which was employed in sacrificing to a very ancient worthy styled Hâu-chî, who was honoured as the father of agriculture. It says,—

"O thou accomplished, great Hâu-chî,
To whom alone 'twas given
To be by what we owe to thee
The correlate of Heaven,

"On all who dwell within our land
Grain food didst thou bestow ;
'Tis to thy wonder-working hand
This gracious boon we owe.

"God had the wheat and barley meant
To nourish all mankind ;
None would have fathomed His intent
But for thy guiding mind."

Confucius has a distinguished place in this sacrificial service. Twice a year, on a certain day in the middle months of spring and autumn, the reigning emperor should go in state to the Imperial College in Peking, and present the appointed offerings before the spirit tablets of Confucius, and of the worthies who have been associated with him in his temples. The first prayer on the occasion in the canon of 1826, greeting the approach of the spirit of the sage, is to the following effect :—"This year, in this month, on this day, I, the Emperor, offer sacrifice to the philosopher K'ung, the ancient teacher, the perfect sage, and say, O teacher, in virtue equal to Heaven and Earth, whose doctrines embrace the time past and the present, thou didst digest and transmit the six classics, and didst hand down thy lessons for all generations! Now in this second month of spring (or autumn), in reverent observance of the old statutes, with victims, silks, spirits, and fruits, I offer sacrifice to thee. With thee are associated the philosopher Yen, continuator of thee, the philosopher Ts'ang, exhibitor of thy fundamental principles; the philosopher Tse-tse, transmitter of thee, and the philosopher M'ang, the second to thee, may'st thou enjoy the offerings!"

I used to think that Confucius in this service received religious worship, and denounced it. But I was wrong. What he received, was the homage of gratitude, and not the worship of adoration. There is a danger of such homage being productive of evil, and leading to superstition and idolatry; but it will not be easily eradicated from the customs of China. We have a remarkable instance of the bad consequences springing from it in the exaltation for the last three centuries of Kwan Yü, an upright, likable warrior of our third century, to be really, so far as the title is concerned, "the god Kwan,"—the god of war.

But I return to the worship of ancestors. That is insisted on in the Confucian teaching as the consummating tribute of filial piety, the virtue which in China occupies the first place in the scale of human excellences. A great virtue it is undoubtedly, but it is exaggerated by the Chinese; and the exaggeration has been on the whole perhaps injurious to the prosperity and progress of the nation.

Certain sayings of Confucius have often been pointed out as showing that he was not satisfied in his own mind as to the continued existence of the dead, or that their spirits really had knowledge of the sacrificial services rendered to them; but I will not enter now on a discussion of them. We are not certain how we should understand them, and he was himself strict in the performance of the services. "He sacrificed to the dead," we are told, "as if they were present, and to the spirits as if they were there." If he were prevented from being present at such a service, and had to employ another to take his place, he considered his absence to be equivalent to his not sacrificing.

At the sacrifice small tablets of wood with the names of the deceased to whom they were dedicated written on them were set up, and called the spirit-tablets, which the spirits were supposed to take possession of for the time. They were ordinarily in an apartment behind the sacrificial hall, and brought out for the occasion. They were returned to their place when the service was over, and the spirits were supposed to have left the temple for their place. But where was their place? Where and in what condition do the spirits of the departed exist?

For one thing, they are believed to be in heaven, and in the presence of God. A very famous name in China was that of King Wăn, whose career led to his son's becoming the first sovereign of the Châu dynasty; and of him after his death it was sung,—

"The royal Wăn now rests on high,
In dignity above the sky;
Châu as a state had long been known;
Heaven's choice of it at last was shown.
Its lords had gained a famous name;
God kinged them when the season came.
King Wăn ruled well when earth he trod;
Now moves his spirit near to God."

In the same way the emperors of the present Manchû line speak of their departed fathers. The concluding hymn for the worship of them in the ancestral temple in the canon of 1826 may be thus rendered :—

"Now ye confront, now ye pass by,
Unbound by conditions of place;
Here ye descend, there ye ascend,
Nor leave of your movements a trace.
Still and deep is the chamber behind;
How restful and blessed its space!
Their home have your spirits in heaven,
The shrines there their tablets embrace.
A myriad years their course shall run,
Nor e'er our filial thoughts efface."

For another thing, the spirits of the departed become tutelary guardians of their posterity, dispensing blessings on them if they pursue the course of well-doing, and punishing them if they do wrong, subject, however, in both cases to the will of God.

Time will not permit me to adduce instances in confirmation of this statement, which could easily be done from the records of Chinese history. They are all cases, however, of good sovereigns and men, who, because of their virtuous course on earth, attained at death to heaven and the presence of God, and had the charge there of watching over the interests that had occupied them and been dear to them in life. But what does the Confucian religion of China teach concerning the future state of bad sovereigns and bad men generally? I may almost reply to this question, "Absolutely nothing." Its oracles are dumb on this interesting and important point. There is no purgatory and no hell in the Confucian literature.

There had grown up even before the time of the Sage a doctrine that the retribution of good and evil takes place in time; and he himself derived no little benefit in his own career from it. The distinction between good and evil is never obscured, nor the different issues of the one and the other. Every moralist writes as if he had been charged, like Isaiah, to "say of the righteous that it shall be well with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him, and of the wicked, Woe unto the wicked; it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." Similar proclamations resound all along the line of Chinese history; but the good to the righteous, and the ill to the wicked, are only the prosperity of the one class and the overthrow and ruin of the other in their worldly estate. The retribution of both cases takes place, not in the persons of the good or the bad, but in those of their descendants. I have said that this view of providence had arisen in China before the time of Confucius. There is a distinct enunciation of it in one of the appendixes to the *Yi-King*, the authorship of which is generally, though not, I think, correctly, ascribed to the Sage himself. It is said, "The family that accumulates goodness is sure to have superabundant happiness; the family that accumulates evil is sure to have superabundant misery." The same teaching appears in the second commandment of our Decalogue. An important and wholesome truth it is that the good-doing and ill-doing of parents are visited on and in their children; but do the sinning parents themselves escape the curse? It is in this form that the subject of future retribution appears among the literati of China, the professed followers of Confucius, at the present day. They do not deny the continued existence of the spirit after death, and they present their sacrifices or offerings to their ancestors, but it is with little or no consideration of whether their lives were good or bad. Those offerings have become unmeaning forms.

One of the most interesting ceremonies conducted at the capital of China is that in which the emperors perform a sacrificial service twice a

year to the spirits of the emperors of all the dynasties before their own. In the canon of 1826, the sovereigns sacrificed to, from Fu-hsi in the thirty-fourth century before Christ down to the close of the Ming dynasty in 1643, amount to a hundred and eighty-eight. These are not nearly all the sovereigns that have reigned during the long period of five thousand years or thereabouts. What names are admitted and what are rejected depends on the reigning emperor and on the members of the Board of Rites. *Shih Hwang Ti* of Ch'in, the great enemy of Confucianism, does not appear, nor sovereigns who proved the ruin of their dynasties. Success seems to be the chief consideration ensuring a place. The second and greatest of the emperors of the reigning line laid it down as a rule for his canon-makers that the character of the sovereigns whom they admitted was not to be too critically examined.

Thus the entire silence of the religion of China with regard to the future of the bad is an unsatisfactory feature in it. The only evil issue of an evil course which it intimates, and that not very distinctly, is to be excluded from sharing in the sacrifices to the dead, the force of which as a motive to virtuous conduct I am unable to appreciate.

I have done, having fulfilled the task which I undertook as well as I am able at present to attain to with the available materials. I think you will judge of Confucius pretty much as I do. His appearance well deserves to be commemorated as an era in the history of his nation; and whatever there is of good and strength in it is mainly due to him. That there is no little of both may safely be inferred from the long continuance of its national history and the growth of its population. It is what it is, politically, socially, and morally, through the teachings of its Sage. It would have been better if those had been allowed to have the sole occupancy of it. But Tâoism, before Confucius and since, and Buddhism since our first century, have been sowing their tares in it. I say so with deference to those who think more highly of those systems than I am able to do. And now in this later time our religion, our commerce, our science and arts, our manners and customs, have all found their way to the empire. Will it be to improve and regenerate it, or to weaken and ruin it? The former will be the case if we act to it according to the golden rule of Confucius, and do to the Chinese as we would have them do to us, and according to the still grander maxim of Lâo-tsze, and overcome their evil by our good. I look forward to the future of China with considerable anxiety, but with more of hope.

TAOISM.

BY FREDERIC H. BALFOUR.

It is, as you are no doubt aware, a commonplace of our school geographies that in China there are Three Religions ; or, to speak more accurately, Three Doctrines. In fact, I do not think it can be said that China has ever produced a genuine Religion, in the strictest sense of the term ; unless, indeed, we admit as an historical fact that primitive Monotheism associated with the prehistoric and semi-mythical Emperors who are said to have flourished between one and two thousand years before the birth of Confucius. Of that eminent man, and the system of which he was the founder, you heard last Sunday from the mouth of the greatest living exponent, among Europeans, of Confucianism. It is not, of course, either my intention or my province to trench upon another man's domain ; but it is necessary for my present contention to record the opinion which, erroneous or well-founded, I very strongly hold, that Confucianism is less a religion than a code of social and political morality. Buddhism, on the other hand, *is* a religion, in a very important sense ; but then it is a foreign importation, like Mohammedanism or Christianity, and has become imbued with no more than a local colouring from its prolonged establishment in China. Taoism, with which we have to deal to-day, bears, it is true, many of the outward and visible signs of a religious system ; but this is a mark of degradation, and is due in a very large measure to the contaminating influences of its contact with those grosser developments of popular Buddhism which flourish so rankly among the lower classes of Chinese. At present Taoism is a base and abject superstition, a religion in the worst and lowest sense, a foolish idolatry supported by an ignorant and venal priesthood commanding the respect of no single class in the community ; a system of unreasoning credulity on the one hand, and of hocus-pocus and imposture on the other. This is not the Taoism of which I am going to speak to you to-day. It has its students among European scholars, but I confess that the subject has little or no interest for me. What I am going to tell you of is not Taoism the degenerate and idolatrous mythology which exists at present, but Taoism the pure and lofty philosophy which arose two thousand years ago, when a wave of inspiration seems to have swept over the entire civilized world, bringing with it that restlessness and vague though earnest expectation of something better yet to come, some epoch-making discovery or revelation of which the previous agitation was a harbinger, that is ever present in periods marked by great intellectual upheavals, and when schools of learning were in process of establishment

under Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, destined to exert an influence upon the world, not for that age merely, but for all time. The great movement which took place in Europe five hundred years before Christ was accompanied by a corresponding movement, almost as great, almost as far-reaching, in a country whose very existence was a dream to the scholars of Greece and Rome; and foremost in time, if not in speculative and metaphysical power, among the leaders of thought in China, was the old Philosopher who, wearying of official cares, devoted the best portion of his life to the study of abstract ideas, and became the acknowledged founder of Taoism, or the doctrine of the Tao.

Now, in order to find out what Taoism really is, we must devote our attention to the word, or character, "Tao" itself. This is composed of two parts, meaning respectively "head" and "to go." I do not think that this analysis will help us very far. As regards its meaning, we find that it is susceptible of several translations, according to the context and the sense in which the word is used. Primarily it means a Road or Way. It is also employed in composition as the verb "to speak." Thirdly, it signifies Principle or Doctrine. The trifling fact that it is susceptible of at least half-a-dozen other meanings, none of which are cognate to the present inquiry, need not delay us here. It is used in the Classics in the sense of the Right Path in which one ought to go, while many European scholars have boldly translated it Reason, thereby identifying it with the Platonic Logos. What is the truth about the matter, and how shall we be best able to find it out?

Well, the position we take up is a very simple one. To put it algebraically, Tao is the x , or unknown quantity, that we have to find. And the first thing to be done is to see what is predicated of this mysterious Thing; how it is described; with what attributes it is credited; where it is to be found; whence it sprang, how it exists, and what its functions are. Then we may find ourselves in a position to discover what it is that answers to these particulars, and profanely to give a name to that which its preachers themselves declared must be for ever nameless.

We are told that it has existed from all eternity. Chuang-tzû, the ablest writer of the Taoist school, says that there never was a time when it was not. Lao-tzû, the reputed founder of Taoism, affirms that the image of it existed before God Himself. It is all pervasive; there is no place where it is not found. It fills the Universe with its grandeur and sublimity; yet it is so subtle that it exists in all its plenitude in the tip of a thread of gossamer. It causes the sun and moon to revolve in their appointed orbits, and gives life to the most microscopic insect. Formless, it is the source of every form we see; inaudible, it is the source of every sound we hear; invisible, it is that which lies behind every external object in the world; inactive, it yet produces, sustains, and vivifies every phenomenon which exists in all the spheres of being. It is impartial, impersonal, and passionless; working but its ends with the remorselessness

of Fate, yet abounding in beneficence to all. "What is Tao?" asks Huai-nan-tzû, another eminent writer on the Taoist philosophy. "It is that which supports heaven and covers the earth; it has no boundaries, no limits; its heights cannot be measured, nor its depths fathomed; it enfolds the entire universe in its embrace, and confers visibility upon that which of itself is formless. . . . It is so tenuous and subtle that it pervades everything just as water pervades mire. It is by Tao that mountains are high and abysses deep; that beasts walk and birds fly; that the sun and moon are bright, and the stars revolve in their courses. . . . When the spring winds blow, the sweet rain falls, and all things live and grow. The feathered ones brood and hatch, the furry ones breed and bear; plants and trees put forth all their glorious exuberance of foliage, birds lay eggs, and animals produce their young; no action is visible outwardly, and yet the work is completed. Shadowy and indistinct, it has no form. Indistinct and shadowy, its resources have no end. Hidden and obscure, it reinforces all things out of formlessness. Penetrating and permeating everything, it never acts in vain."

Such are a few of the attributes ascribed to the nameless Principle we are considering. What ideas do they suggest to our mind? Such, I believe, as can scarcely be expressed in any single word. Lao-tzû and his followers recognised the fact that for this mysterious entity there can be no name, and so, as Lao-tzû himself says, they were forced to speak of it simply as Tao. We in the West have practically arrived at the same conclusion. What is it that makes flowers grow up and water flow down, which causes the showers to fall and the sun to shine, which guides the stars in their flaming courses, regulates the seasons, endows the butterfly with its radiant hues, makes heat expand and cold contract, gives one man black hair and another red, and, in a word, is the cause of every phenomenon around us, the mainspring of the huge machine of which we form a part? We, too, have failed to find a name for it, and so we call it *Nature*. Translate Tao, as used in this sense, by our common word Nature—or, if you prefer it, Principle, Course, or Way of Nature—and I think we shall have discovered the key to Taoism; using the word, of course, not as applied poetically to the visible Universe, the *natura naturata*, but in the sense of *natura naturans*, the abstract Cause, the initial Principle of life and order, the hypostatic quiddity which underlies all phenomena, and of which they are a manifestation only.

Tao, then, is Nature; Taoism is the philosophy of Nature; and Taoists are in the fullest sense of the word Naturalistic philosophers. Let us proceed now to consider the developments and adaptations of the great Naturalistic theory, in its relation to speculative cosmogony, in the first place, and afterwards to the more practical details of social and political life.

The Taoists have a good deal to tell us about the Evolution of the visible Universe. "There was a time," says Chuang-tzû, "when all things had a beginning. The time when there was yet no beginning had a

beginning itself. There was a beginning to the time when the time that had no beginning had not begun. There is existence, and there is also non-existence. In the time which had no beginning there existed Nothing—or a Vacuum. When the time which had no beginning had not yet begun, then there also existed Nothing. Suddenly, there was Nothing; but it cannot be known, respecting existence and non-existence, what was certainly existing and what was not."

Now I dare say that that sounds to you so much empty nonsense. But I will ask you to compare it with the following utterance of no less a writer than the late lamented Mr. Proctor, who traverses the same ground as this old Chinese philosopher of two thousand years ago, though he speaks in rather clearer language :—

"Those," he says, "who can, may find relief in believing in absolutely void space and absolutely unoccupied time before some very remote, but not infinitely remote epoch, which may in such belief be called the beginning of all things; but the void time before *that* beginning can have had no beginning, unless it were preceded by time not unoccupied by events, which is inconsistent with the supposition. We find no absolute beginning if we look backwards."

In the first chapter of the works of Lieh-tzū, another very prominent writer of this school, we find a more definite speculation about the origin of life and motion, conveyed in very striking terms :—

"There is a Life that is uncreated;
 There is a Transformer who is changeless.
 The Uncreated alone can produce life;
 The Changeless alone can evolve change.
 That Life cannot but produce;
 That Transformer cannot but transform.
 Wherefore creations and transformations are perpetual,
 And these perpetual creations and transformations continue through all time.
 They are seen in the Male and Female Principles of Nature,
 They are displayed in the Four Seasons.
 The Uncreated stands, as it were, alone;
 The Changeless comes and goes;
 His duration can have no end,
 Peerless and One—His ways are past finding out."

In the same book we have a very interesting discussion, between an Emperor and his Minister, about the extent and eternity of matter. The Emperor begins by asking whether matter existed from the beginning of all things; and the Minister replies by asking how, if it did not, it came to exist at present, and whether their descendants would be justified in denying that matter existed in his Majesty's own day. The Emperor naturally enough rejoins that, by this argument, matter must have existed from all eternity—a remark that his Minister parries by saying that no records remain of the time before matter existed, and that all such knowledge is beyond the scope of humanity. To the question of the Emperor whether there is any limit to the expanse of the Universe, the Minister replies by avowing his entire ignorance; and when the Emperor presses

the matter home by urging that "where nothing exists, that is the Infinite, but where there is existence there must be finality," the Minister says plainly that nobody knows anything about the Infinite. But we know this much: Heaven and Earth are simply contained in the great whole of the infinite Universe; and how can we tell whether there may not be an Unseen Universe, above and beyond that smaller Cosmos that is within the range of our perception?

At this point it may be useful to deal very briefly with a question which has, no doubt, occurred to many of you already, namely, Does the Taoist system include a Personal Creator and Moral Governor of the Universe? Well, the question is one more easily asked than answered. It is true that there are frequent references in the Taoist Classics to some Being, Influence, or Power, who is spoken of as the Creator. There are also passages, here and there, in which the word "Ti," or God, occurs. But such allusions are very obscure, very vague, very indefinite; while the term which is generally used for the verb "to create" implies less creation, as we understand it, than transformation or metamorphosis. Nor is there, as far as my own researches teach me, any definite statement as to the relations existing between this very shadowy Creator and the Tao. Some persons have hazarded the theory that Tao and the Taoist Creator are identical; that the Tao, in point of fact, is God. But this will not hold water. Tao is impersonal and passionless, and, in one sentence of what we may call the Taoist Bible, is spoken of in direct antithesis to God. Then, again, the workings of Tao explain everything, so that there is neither the room nor the necessity for a Personal Creator. In fact, the Taoist theory of Creation appears to me to foreshadow in a very remarkable manner the latest conclusions arrived at by scientific men in the present day. The nebulous haze which Professor Tyndall regards as the source of all material things, had a place in the philosophy of the ancient Taoists, who spoke of the primordial aura that eventually underwent condensation and concretion, and finally emerged in the form of solid matter, with definite and various shapes. Evolution lay at the root of Taoist cosmical science, and we find passages in Haeckel's *History of Creation* which might have been written, word for word, by any of the Taoist authors, passages which I would read to you did the time at my disposal permit. The Taoist theory, however, cannot be more ably or concisely summed up than in the words of Lucretius: "Nature is seen to do everything of herself spontaneously, without the meddling of the gods."

Now, according to the Taoist theory, man is to be regarded as simply a part of the Universe, an offshoot of creation, a manifestation, like everything else, of the universal and inherent Tao. And this, be it remarked, is not a scientific or speculative opinion merely. It is a powerful moral factor, inducing a resignation to destiny and a submission to the laws of Nature which deserve our respectful attention. Listen, for instance, to the following utterances on the subject of Death. To the Taoist,

Death was no King of Terrors, but rather an inevitable and welcome change, a turn in the wheel of the Universe, an event as natural as the fading of an autumn leaf or the succession of the Four Seasons. "Poverty," says Lieh-tzŭ, "is the common lot of scholars, and death is the end of us all. What cause for sorrow is there, then, in quietly fulfilling one's destiny and awaiting the close of life?" "Death," he says, in another place, "is to life as going away is to coming. How can we know that to die here is not to be born elsewhere? How can we tell whether, in their eager rush for life, men are not under a delusion? How can I tell whether, if I die to-day, my lot may not prove far preferable to what it was when I was originally born?" "Ah! men know the dreadfulness of death; but they do not know its rest." "How excellent is it, that from all antiquity Death has been the common lot of men! It is repose for the good man, and a hiding-away of the bad. Death is just a going home again. The dead are those who have gone home, while we, who are living, are still wanderers."

So far, I think you will agree with me that the teachings of Taoism are not devoid of much spiritual force and beauty. What, however, do they mainly inculcate in practical, everyday life? Spontaneity, simplicity, purity, gentleness, and, in a word, goodness.

Let me explain what I mean by spontaneity. The original constitution of every man being the direct gift of Nature—or rather, an actual part of Nature itself—it follows that it should be jealously preserved intact, in all its pristine purity. This is the grand and primary object of the true Taoist—the preservation of his Heaven-implanted Nature. And how is this to be accomplished? By imitating the great Mother. Nature is spontaneous in all her works; therefore the Sage should be spontaneous too, not acting from design, but following the natural promptings of his heart in accord with his surroundings. Nature never strives; therefore the Sage should guard against striving too. Nature is ever passive; therefore the Sage should let things take their course, and be content with following in their wake. Ambition, scheming, passion, desire—any attention to external objects of whatever kind—are all so much disordering, or spoliation, of the original nature of man, and as such should be utterly discarded. Even the active cultivation of virtues, such as benevolence, rectitude, and propriety, is condemned; Nature requires no effort to stimulate her growth, and all the Sage has to do is to bring himself into perfect conformity with her. All such passions, accomplishments, and attributes, being phases of disturbance or strife, are called, in Taoist phrase, the Human nature of man, in contradistinction to that Heavenly or Inherent nature with which he is endowed. "Wherefore," says Chuang-tzŭ, "do not develop this artificial, human, or engrafted nature; but *do* develop that Inherent or Natural nature which is the inheritance of you all." Huai-nan-tzŭ, to whom I have already referred, brings out this point with admirable lucidity. "What is it," he asks, "that we mean.

when we talk about the Natural or Inherent? It is that which is homogeneous, pure, simple, undefiled, ungarnished, upright, luminous, and immaculate, and which has never undergone any mixture or adulteration from the beginning. And what is the Human or Artificial? It is that which has been adulterated with shrewdness, crookedness, dexterity, hypocrisy, and deceit; which bends itself into compliance with the world, and defers to the customs of the age. For instance: the ox has horns and a divided hoof, while the horse has a dishevelled mane and a complete hoof; this is the Heavenly, or Natural. But if you put a bit into the horse's mouth, and pierce the nose of the ox, this is the Human, or artificial." In other words, all attempts to improve upon, or interfere with, things as they are in their natural state, are violations of Nature, and to be condemned accordingly. Nor is this theory difficult of application to many institutions in our own day. We may be sure that if any of these old Taoists were to appear among us now, they would tell us boldly, "If Nature has given you black hair, don't try to dye it yellow; if you have a sallow or a pale complexion, don't daub it with pink paint; if your waist measures five-and-twenty inches round, don't try and squeeze it into eighteen. All such attempts are violations of Nature, and are sure to bring their own punishment along with them."

But to bring himself into conformity with Nature, it is imperative that the Sage should be always and completely passive. This is expressed by a Chinese formula which may be variously rendered "not-doing," "non-exertion," "inertia," "absolute inaction," or, perhaps best of all, "masterly inactivity." In addition to the idea of undisturbed quiescence it embraces also that of spontaneity and designlessness; so that even the rigid adherence to an inactive policy is robbed of its virtue if it be adopted with intent. The very effort to obtain possession of Nature, says Chuang-tzū, defeats itself, and for the simple reason that it *is* an effort. A man must be passionless as well as motionless; he must be content to leave himself to the influences which surround him, and discard all idea of helping on the work; he must banish all desire from his heart; he must concert no schemes and form no plans; he must never anticipate emergencies, but simply mould himself according to any circumstances that may arise. And especially is this of importance in the world of politics. Here the formula I have referred to must be rendered "non-interference," that wise and far-sighted policy the world is so slow to learn. The Taoist condemns over-legislation, and justly points to the peddling, meddling system of a so-called paternal government as the cause of anarchy and ruin. Leave the people alone, is the wise maxim of Taoism; don't harass them with perpetual interference, and vexatious efforts at protection. Let things take their course and find their level; let the people develop their resources in a natural and spontaneous way. Charles Kingsley and Herbert Spencer are here anticipated by a couple of thousand years. Never do anything, says the Taoist politician, for the mere sake of doing

it ; never do anything that is not absolutely necessary ; never forget that the great end of legislation is to render legislation itself superfluous. Let Nature work unimpeded in social and political life as well as in the sphere of physics or of morals ; then your subjects will be contented with their lot, and your kingdom free from conspiracies, dissensions, and disaster. Above all, do nothing to disturb their primitive simplicity. Do not seek to replace their rough instruments of labour by complicated machines. Such refinements lead to luxury, to scheming, to ambition, and to discontent. The very exercise of ingenuity displayed in the production of labour-saving and delicate apparatus implies a scheming mind. Therefore discourage artificial innovations. The secret of happiness is to be found in quiescence, simplicity, and content ; and the only way to attain these is to bring body, passions, intellect, and will into absolute conformity with Nature.

It would be strange, indeed, if such teachings as these had not borne fruit in inducing many persons to retire altogether from the world and embrace a life of seclusion. In fact, the list of Taoist hermits is a pretty long one, and many were those who, retiring to some mountain cave, and devoting themselves to abstract contemplation, received urgent appeals from kings and princes to come and assist them with their wisdom in the task of government, only to reject the petition. They generally chose for their retreat some rocky glen shut in by mountains, sheltered from the burning sun by the thick foliage of trees, and surrounded by every natural feature which makes a landscape lovely. There they passed their lives in that mental abstraction and freedom from interest in mundane affairs which is the nearest approach to the summit of bliss and virtue. Their idea of happiness was, after all, a very pure one. Perfect indifference to love and hate ; the annihilation of all passions, desires, and even preferences ; no striving, or wishing to strive ; nothing but profound apathy and absolute insensibility to those things which, painful or pleasurable, wear out the lives of men : such is the Taoist Ideal. It is a return to the pure, original, self-existent nature of man, which has been despoiled and injured by contact with worldly matters. And there are a few of these Taoists yet to be found, here and there—men who are almost entirely uncontaminated by the follies and impostures of modern popular Taoism, and who may be said to represent the true Apostolic Succession in the Taoist Church. In certain instances, some old worthies, who have been dead and gone for centuries, are believed by the simple mountaineers of China to be still alive. Far away in the mountain range which stretches from Peking across the provinces of Chih-li and Shan-tung, there is one very sacred peak called the Mount of a Hundred Flowers. It is covered with wild flowers, and its bosky dells are said, and with some truth, to be the lurking-places of wolves and panthers. There, according to the legend, live, partly embedded in the soil, certain ancient Taoist hermits. By a long course of absolute conformity with Nature they have attained

to immortality, and are now in the enjoyment of unearthly bliss. To use a Taoist phrase, their faces are washed by the rains of heaven, and their hair combed by the wind. Their arms are crossed upon their breasts, and their nails have grown so long that they curl round their necks. Flowers and grass have taken root in their bodies and flourish luxuriantly; when a man approaches them, they turn their eyes upon him, but do not speak. Some of them are over three hundred years old; some, not much over a century; but all have attained to immortality, and some day they will find that their bodies, which have been so long in wearing out, will collapse from sheer withdrawal of vitality, and their spirits be set free. All this is tanciful and fabulous enough; and when I ascended this mysterious mountain a few years ago I certainly did not come across any of these very interesting old persons. But it is undeniable that that indifference or aversion to vulgar objects of desire that characterizes the true Taoist has laid China under many a debt of gratitude. The votary of the Naturalistic philosophy does not always become a hermit any more than a Christian always becomes a clergyman. He is often in the world, and occupies high offices of State. But circumstances make no difference in his character. He is always the same, while living in a mean and dirty lane and drinking from a gourd, as he is in the palace itself, the trusted Minister of a monarch. In this position he retains the same incorruptibility, the same indifference to power, that he has when living in obscurity. China has had many such Ministers, and she is rightly proud of them. Emperors and princes are said to have gone in person to solicit the services of some stern recluse whose fame had reached their ears, and to have been unsuccessful in their suit. The delineation of such characters forms a bright page in many a volume of dusty Chinese lore, and they are now held up to the reverence and imitation of the statesmen of to-day.

I now wish to give you some idea of the moral teachings of Taoism, as exemplified in the classical and popular works of Taoist authors. And the first extract I have to place before you, from the book of Lao-tzŭ himself, is an aphorism which, I am sure you will agree with me, is on a level with the highest teachings of Christianity. It is short, and to the point: "Recompense injury with kindness." We say, "Return good for evil." And it is worthy of remark, that when this sublime doctrine was submitted to the judgment of Confucius he at once condemned it. "With what, then, will you recompense kindness?" he replied. "Recompense kindness with kindness, but injury with justice." Confucius, excellent man as he was, was too narrow and formal in his views to rise to the height of the Taoist Sage. "Tao," says Lao-tzŭ elsewhere, "is the jewel of the good man, the guardian of the bad." "He who knows others is wise; he who knows himself is enlightened. He who overcomes others is strong; he who overcomes himself is mighty. He who knows when he has enough is rich. He whose memory perishes not when he dies lives

for ever." "There is no sin greater than giving rein to desire; there is no misery greater than discontent; there is no calamity more direful than the greed of gain. Therefore the sufficiency of contentment is an everlasting sufficiency." "There are three things which I regard as precious, which I grasp and prize. The first is Compassion; the second is Moderation; the third is Modesty." "The weakest things in this world subjugate the strongest." "There is nothing under Heaven weaker or softer than water; yet it overcomes the hardest and strongest things." "The highest form of goodness resembles water, which is beneficial to everything, and that without struggling." "When there are many prohibitive enactments in the Empire, the people get poorer and poorer. When the people accumulate excess of wealth and goods, both State and families become demoralized. When men are over-skilful, the use of fantastical or curious things arises. When punishments are overdone, malefactors increase in number. Wherefore the Sage says, I do nothing, and the people reform of their own accord; I love quietude, and the people become spontaneously upright; I take no measures, and the people enrich themselves; I have no desires, and the people naturally become simple." "The Sage dwells in the world with a timid reserve; but his mind blends in sympathy with all. The people turn their eyes and ears up to him, and the Sage thinks of them as his children." "He who bears the reproach of his country shall be called the Lord of the Land; he who bears the calamities of his country shall be called the King of the World."

I have already referred to Chuang-tzŭ, a philosopher who lived two hundred years after his great master—the ablest, boldest, and most audacious of the Taoist writers. It is one of his greatest glories that he protested, with all the eloquence and satire at his command, against the exaggerated reverence paid to books, to tradition, and to authority, by the Confucian school; and that he claimed and exercised the fullest and completest liberty of thought and argument. There are some striking sentences scattered up and down his fascinating but most difficult pages. "Wherever one's treasure may be," he says in one place, "thither will the heart of man follow it." I need not remind you of a corresponding passage in the Sermon on the Mount. "Those who dream about the pleasures of the wine-cup," he says again, "weep and lament at sunrise. Those who weep in their dreams will go a-hunting when the dawn breaks." A sanguine man who jumps too hastily at conclusions is compared to one who expects to hear an egg crow at daybreak, or thinks he can shoot a bird by looking at a cross-bow. "For the Pure Men of old," he tells us elsewhere, "life had no attractions, and death no terrors. Living, they experience no elation; dying, they offered no resistance. Being born, they accepted the fact; when the oblivion of death came, they just returned to what they had been before. Thus it was that their hearts were free from care, and they preserved a condition of absolute inactivity." And I must not forget a characteristic story told of Chuang-tzŭ himself

upon his deathbed. His last injunction to his weeping relatives was to leave his corpse uninterred. "I will have Heaven and Earth for my sarcophagus," he said; "the Sun and Moon shall be the insignia where I lie in state, and all Creation shall be mourners at my funeral." His friends implored him to forego this strange request, pointing out that the birds would mutilate his corpse; but he replied, "What matters that? Above are the birds of the air, below are the worms and ants; if you rob one to feed the other, what injustice is there done?"

Chuang-tzŭ was nothing if not paradoxical, and one of his favourite theories was the utility of uselessness. A friend of his once complained that he had a tree, the wood of which was so coarse, viscous, and full of knots, as to be perfectly worthless; its leaves were fetid, and its branches gnarled and crooked, so that no carpenter would cast a glance at it as he passed by. Chuang-tzŭ replied that it was to its very uselessness that the tree owed its prolonged existence; for just as the beautifully marked skins of the leopard and the tiger led to their being slain, so do the fine properties of superior wood lead to the destruction of a tree. In fact, a coarse and inferior tree, on account of its unfitness to be used for timber, lives out its natural term of years, while one of the monarchs of the forest falls a speedy prey to the woodman's axe; wherefore it is better to be an unlearned and ignorant man, left to the enjoyment of a retired and simple existence, than a clever, pushing, ambitious person, liable to be led into the dangers of public life, where his career may be cut short, either by the cares and responsibilities of his position, or by the vicissitudes and intrigues that will beset him. "Men understand the use of useful things," says Chuang-tzŭ, "but they have yet to learn the use of things that are useless."

Lieh-tzŭ does not hold so high a place in the Taoist hierarchy as Chuang-tzŭ, but he is, nevertheless, an author of great merit and no small originality. He is principally remarkable for the collection of racy and entertaining stories which his book contains; and, as my lecture has, I am afraid, been a rather dry one hitherto, I will give you some specimens. The first one inculcates a lesson akin to Chuang-tzŭ's theory of uselessness, and may be called, "Moderation is the Best Policy." An elderly man lay dying, and as he felt his end drawing near he called his son to him, and said, "The King has sought to load me with honours, but I have consistently declined them. When I am dead, he will seek to bestow honours upon you; but mind what I say—accept no land from him that is worth anything. Now between the States of Ch'ü and Yueh there is a bit of ground that is of no use to anybody, and has, moreover, a bad reputation, for many people believe it to be haunted. This is a kind of property that you may keep for ever." Soon after this the man died, and the King offered a beautiful piece of land to his son. The youth, however, declined it, and begged for the bad piece. This was granted to him; and he has never lost possession of it to this day.

At the time when Lieh-tzū wrote, the petty Kings of China were for ever neglecting the welfare of their own States in order to attack their neighbours; a policy which naturally provoked the indignation of the Taoist Sages. The following anecdote, headed "Guard your own Frontier," conveys the gentle though cutting rebuke of Lieh-tzū. A certain Duke once started to attend a Conference of Feudal Princes, the object of which was to organize an attack upon one of the States of the Empire. He was accompanied by an armed force and by one of his principal Ministers, who was observed, during the journey, to cast up his eyes and laugh. "What are you laughing at?" demanded the Duke. "I was laughing," replied the Minister, "about a certain neighbour of mine. He was escorting his wife on her way to pay a visit to her parents, when he espied a very pretty girl picking mulberry leaves for silkworms. Delighted at the *rencontre*, my friend stopped to talk to her, when, happening to turn his head, he saw somebody else paying attention to his wife. That was what I was laughing to myself about." The Duke understood the hint. He did not proceed any farther, but led his soldiers back. It was, however, too late; for they had not arrived in their own country when news reached them that an enemy had come during their absence and attacked their northern frontier.

One more story, and I have done with Lieh-tzū. The Taoists, as you are aware, despised the Confucianists, and were never tired of poking fun at Confucius. Here is a specimen of their humour. One day, as Confucius was on a journey, he came upon two small boys quarrelling, and asked what was the matter. The first replied, "I contend that when the sun rises it is near to us, and that at the zenith it is a long way off." "And I," said the other, "say that it is farthest when it rises, and nearest in the middle of the day." "It isn't," protested the first. "When the sun rises, it looks as big as the tent of a cart, while in the middle of the day it is only the size of a saucer. Isn't it clear that when it is farthest it looks small, and when nearest it looks big?" Then the second rejoined, "But when the sun rises, it is quite chilly and cold, while at midday it is broiling hot! Doesn't it stand to reason that it is hottest when it is near, and coldest when far off?" Confucius confessed himself unable to decide between them; whereupon both the urchins mocked him, saying, "Go to; who says that you are a learned man?"

I now pass on to the consideration of two more popular works, which embody a development of Taoism almost entirely untainted with that superstitious element which so soon began to corrupt the purity of the primitive philosophy. The first to which I ask your attention is the *Sū Shā*, or *Book of Plain Words*, a tractate supposed to date from the year 245 B.C. or thereabouts. It constitutes an application of the Taoist doctrines to political, social, and individual life; and, making allowance for differences of time and place, presents a remarkable resemblance to the Jewish *Book of Proverbs*. The writer is addressing, first and foremost, a statesman;

and whatever may be thought of the trustworthiness and incorruptibility of Chinese mandarins at the present day, it is unquestionable that the standard here set before them is a very high one. The public man, we are told, should be one whose conduct is a pattern for others to imitate, whose wisdom enables him to give just judgments, whose personal sincerity causes sincerity in others, who can incur hatred and suspicion without deserting his post, and who never takes advantage of his position to secure benefits for himself. "There is nothing," continues our author, "that will enable you to pursue your course in greater peace than the *patient bearing of insult*." "There is no deeper source of joy than the love of goodness; nothing that will give you a profounder insight into hidden things than perfect sincerity in word and deed; but nothing more certain to bring ruin upon you than partiality or injustice."

You must understand that these aphorisms, while applicable to individuals, were primarily intended for the guidance of the governing classes, and that at a time when the disordered condition of the country demanded the exercise of special tact and absolute incorruptibility on the part of magistrates and statesmen. This point is brought out with even greater clearness in the quotations which follow, the shrewdness and knowledge of human nature displayed in which is very marked. "Those whose commands are at variance with their consciences," says the author, "will meet with failure. If a man is *angry without inspiring awe*, the delinquency which has irritated him will be repeated. It is dangerous, first to treat a man with contumely, and afterwards entrust him with responsibility. The man who hides an alienated heart behind a friendly face will be shunned. The sovereign who loves flatterers, and holds aloof from the honest and true, will soon see his kingdom fall. To make little of one's own faults, and be severe on those of others, is not the way to govern. He who bestows rewards with a grudging face will receive a grudging service. He who is niggardly in bestowing, and yet looks for a large return, will get no return at all. He who employs people without regard to their peculiar capabilities, will incur the evil results of his carelessness. He who, in a position of honour, forgets the friends of humbler days, will not enjoy his honours long. If you have no confidence in yourself, you will be distrustful of others; but if you can trust yourself, you will not suspect the people. If you drive a carriage in the ruts of another carriage that has been overturned, you will meet with the same disaster; so, if you follow the example set by a State that has been already ruined, yours will be ruined too."

So much for the *Book of Plain Words*, a manual of much practical and moral value, intended for the guidance of governors. Let us now turn to a more popular treatise, called the *Book of Recompenses*, addressed more particularly to the governed. This work, the Chinese name of which is the *Kan Ying I'ien*, is read almost universally in China, and exercises much influence over millions of lives. In it we are brought face to face

with the great doctrine of rewards and retributions; and the bulk of the book consists of one tremendously long sentence, containing in my translation of it no fewer than one thousand four hundred words, enumerating the various crimes and misdemeanours which bring the judgment of Heaven upon the perpetrators. The exhortations with which the book opens are singularly beautiful:—

“Advance in all that is in harmony with good; retreat from all that is opposed to it. Walk not in the paths of depravity, nor deceive yourselves by sinning in the dark where none can see you. Accumulate virtue and store up merit; treat all with gentleness and love; be loyal, be dutiful; be respectful to your elders and kind to your juniors; be upright yourselves in order that you may reform others; compassionate the fatherless and widow; reverence the aged, cherish the young; do not injure even little insects, or grass, or trees. Pity the wickedness of others and rejoice at their virtues; succour them in their distresses, and rescue them when in danger; when a man gains his desires, let it be as though his good fortune were your own; when one suffers loss, as though you suffered it yourself. Never publish the failings of another, or make a parade of your own merits; put a stop to evil, and afford every encouragement to goodness; be not grasping, but learn to content yourself with little. When you are reviled, cherish no resentment; when you receive favours, do so as deprecating your deserts; be kind and generous without seeking any return, and never repent of anything you may give to others. This,” concludes our author, “is to be a good man; one whom heaven will guard, whom all will respect, whom blessings and honours will accompany, whom no evil will touch, and whom all good spirits will defend.” It may, indeed, be questioned whether even Christianity itself affords a higher or more touching portraiture of “the good man” than is sketched in these beautiful sentences. Then follows the long catalogue of sins, any one of which is sufficient to evoke calamities of the direst nature. Among them are enumerated the worrying of dumb creatures, accepting bribes, slaughtering enemies who have tendered their submission, attributing other people’s misfortunes to their sins, borrowing money and then longing for the lender’s death, mocking another’s physical deformities, going to law, forsaking old friends for new, making mischief between relations, and returning evil for good. Finally, we are implored to read and study the book with earnestness and singleness of heart. The first requisite for profiting by its admonitions is unquestioning faith; the second, diligence in self-cultivation; the third, determination, or perseverance; the fourth, complete sincerity. “To attempt to put away the vice and depravity of a lifetime when the sun of life is setting, is like trying to extinguish a blazing wagon-load of hay with a cup of water.” If faith be small, the blessing will be small; if great, the blessing will be great; while if faith be mixed with doubt, self-injury and self-loss will be the inevitable result. In conclusion:—“Honoured reader,” says the author, “I urge you to advance

swiftly, fearlessly, and with your whole heart in the course I have here laid down. Know that we are surrounded on all sides by a multitude of spiritual beings, who take note of all we do. Therefore, be watchful, and examine yourself strictly; act in accordance with these admonitions at all times; then you will never fail to do justice to your real self." "The connection between actions and their consequences is the mysterious law of God—the changeless decree pronounced by the Judge of the unseen world."

It would seem, from this last remarkable expression, that, at one stage in Taoist development, belief in a Personal God or Supreme Judge had grown up. The book I have been quoting from is the most popular religious work in China, and naturally affords a marked contrast to the philosophical and abstract ideas contained in the primitive classics. As I have already told you, pure Taoism knows nothing of what we understand by God; and the theistic conception seems to have been imported into it at a much later date. In all other respects, however, the development of Taoism has been one of hopeless degeneracy. The lofty asceticism inculcated by Lao-tzū became vulgarized into a means by which to achieve the sublimation of the body. Speculative research into the mysteries of Nature was degraded into an attempt to transmute the baser metals into gold; aspirations after a never-ending life beyond the grave sank into the meaner pursuits of prolonged temporal existence; and communings with the spiritual intelligences of Nature were resolved into a base belief in witchcraft, by proficiency in which the Taoist priest arrogated to himself the power of exorcism over evil spirits. I happen to be acquainted with the present Pope, High Priest, or Grand Wizard of Taoism. His name is Chang, and he is commonly spoken of as Chang T'ien Shih, or Chang the Heavenly Teacher. He claims, and is believed, to be the direct lineal descendant by metempsychosis of a celebrated sorcerer named Chang Tao-ling, who lived early in the Christian era. He possesses the secret of immortality, and is regarded with the utmost veneration by the more uneducated classes in China. He is a great exorcist, and is believed to wield dominion over all the spirits of the Universe and the unseen powers generally, by means of a magic sword. His palace is situated in the province of Kiang-hsi, where he mimics imperial state, has a large retinue of courtiers, confers ranks and honours among ghosts, spirits, and minor deities with all the dignity of an actual sovereign, and keeps a long row of jars full of captured demons, whom he has disarmed and bottled-up from doing further mischief. When I saw him several years ago, he appeared to be about forty years old, of middle height, smooth face, and very oily manners; and he was good enough to write, and present me with, the remarkable scroll that you are now looking at. It is a charm to ward off evil spirits.

But my time is up, and I do not want your last impressions of Taoism to be connected with any such superstitious folly as is represented by:

Pope Chang. Let your thoughts revert, rather, to the pure, wise, deep, philosophy of Nature ; to those calm and unworldly sages who are associated with all that is best in Taoism ; to their quietism and passionlessness, their profound insensibility to all those desires, attractions, schemings, pleasures, and ambitions which injure and destroy the pure, original nature of men ; and to the beautiful teachings which those old patriarchs have left behind them. When you think of Taoism, don't think of the Taoist Pope, with his army of ignorant and juggling priests ; think of it rather as a pure and fine philosophy, the moral outcome of which finds its expression in some of the words I have already quoted to you :—

“Recompense injury with kindness.”

“Resent it not, when you are reviled.”

“Nothing will give you greater peace than the patient bearing of insult.”

“He who overcomes others is strong : he who overcomes himself is mighty.”

THE RELIGIONS OF JAPAN.

By C. PROUNDES (late of Japan),

(*Member Royal United Service Institution ; Hon. Corresponding Member
Geographical Society, Japan ; Hon. Fell. Soc. Sc. Lit. & Art, Lond.*)

THE religions of Japan present to the intelligent inquirer and industrious student an inexhaustible fund of valuable material, especially so to those engaged in ethical culture ; and of the many interesting phases of Oriental thought, none will better repay the time and labour.

The lecturer's claim to treat upon this subject, is based on the fact of some years' residence in Japan, mostly in temples, during the most critical and momentous period of its modern history, and, with knowledge of the vernacular, he discussed such matters with intelligent natives and priests of various sects.

He was much impressed by the great amiability and innate courtesy of all classes, their high sense of duty and patriotism, and neighbourly good qualities, as well as the broadness and liberality with which all such subjects were discussed, having regard to the feelings of others, even when dissenting from them in opinion.

The geographical position of the group of islands forming the Japanese Empire is an important factor in its condition of intellectual and religious thought and development ; and the unique stability of its chief political institutions is another element of moment.

Learned persons have been in all times most welcome in Japan ; and the gifted natives who travelled far and wide returned with vast stores of knowledge. To understand the religious life of a nation, ~~the alien, not~~ always welcome, must get at the inner life, achieve the entire confidence, learn the language and modes of thought and the sources from which they are derived. The reticence of the natives—not to be surprised at, their confidences having been so often, alas ! betrayed—has precluded exhaustive information being afforded to all comers.

For a lucid and concise exposition, it may be well to deal with the questions chronologically, so far as the annals of Japan, confirmed by other sources of knowledge, aid us for the earlier periods.

It is perhaps most convenient to divide the subject into indigenous and alien cults ; but they are so very closely interwoven that it is not easy to separate so complicated, though not at all homogeneous a whole.

The most important section will be dealt with by another lecturer, who will speak on Shintôism—so that will not be trespassed upon further than is absolutely essential.

The origin of a people, or at least the sources whence they derived their radical religious ideas, and, if possible, also the eras when such were received, will necessarily have to be entered upon.

Japan may have been peopled from several widely separated sources, from north to south. It certainly has been visited by ancient scholars from far-distant parts of the continent.

The survivals of natural religion yet to be found are highly interesting to the more advanced student; but it is the first development of the ethical ideals, through superstitions, religions, and philosophy, that chiefly concerns us.

About the time of the early days of Rome, a highly intellectual race appeared on the arena of Japanese history; and the first few centuries appear to have been fully occupied in reducing the very barbarous autochthones to something like peaceful order; and teaching the primitive arts. Since then, in unbroken descent, we have had, unique in history, a long line of rulers, the present being the hundred and twenty-third in the course of the twenty-five and a half centuries; and Japan's is the oldest imperial dynasty existent, chief of the civil and religious life of the empire; and on this the national cultus is founded. Spiritual activity is therefore very ancient, and is undoubtedly the development of far earlier teaching.

Chinese and Indian literature, philosophy, metaphysics, and science were introduced, and are to Japan what Greek and Latin classics are to ourselves.

The classics, of which Confucius is the best-known collector and editor, the philosophy of the Taoists, and later the Indian, followed by Buddhism, entered into Japanese education, and influenced thought and conduct.

In passing through China, Indian dogma became materially leavened, so that we shall find many sects in Japan, but all quite as harmonious as, and quarrelling no more than do, sectarians nearer home. There are more than a dozen sects of Buddhism now in Japan, several of which have numerous sub-sects.

The Chinese and Indians who arrived from time to time in Japan, as well as the Japanese who returned from India, China, etc., founded many distinct sects, and taught much that diverged, sometimes conflicting with the transcendental Buddhism of Aryavata.

Buddhism was resisted strenuously for a long time, at first by the custodians of the shrines of the indigenous cultus; and it was not till the fifth century, a thousand years after the Buddha, Gautama Shakya Muni, that it obtained a foothold. One of the imperial family took up the cause, like Asoka of India, and became the "Constantine" of Japanese religion.

Whatever Christianity may or may not owe to earlier Buddhism, there can be little doubt that later Buddhism contains elements of Christianity as of other beliefs.

From time to time efforts were made, more or less successful, to revive the pure *Shinto* or *Kami no Michi*—divine way or spiritual doctrine; and this must have greatly influenced Buddhism, and enforced some reform within itself, and purified it of the demoralizing influences a sacerdotal class always permits to flourish. The growth of power of a theocracy here, as in all time, had its evils; and Buddhism is no exception in history.

The various sects that arose each based their doctrine on some special portions of the great body of teaching as received from India, leavened and modified by Chinese and Japanese philosophies and modes of thought.

The original eight sects, some offshoots from those established in China during the preceding centuries, grew into others. Some flourished; others declined, or were absorbed in newer, stronger movements.

It must be remembered that Buddhism was a successful revolt against Brahmanical domination and monopolizing of sacred offices and high-caste exclusive privileges.

Some of the sects taught that good works and the acquisition of "merit" were all-essential to salvation; others impressed—and still do so—the efficacy of continued repetition of exclamatory invocation, or recitation of some ritual. Some work themselves up to a point of religious ecstasy, just like more or less ignorant and bigoted enthusiastic fanatics much nearer home to-day.

The intonation of prayers, with accompaniment of bell, or gong, or drum, was one of the disadvantages of residence in temple buildings; but one got used to it, like other matters, in time, by the exercise of a little patience and philosophy, until at last the monotonous, yet not always unmusical, certainly generally rhythmical, sounds became positively somniferous.

Just a few words by way of comparison as to the contrasts between the fundamental points of Christianity and the prevailing beliefs of the far East, in all courtesy and respect for the feelings of professing Christians.

The Redemption, the basis of Christianity, finds no place, no parallel; indeed, so far from sympathy, it is received with abhorrence by the great majority of natives, the educated especially, however carefully the feeling may be suppressed in the company of missionaries and foreigners avowedly enthusiastic Christians. The idea of the Deity lampooned by Bobbie Burns, in his satire on the "Elect," finds no place in the religious conception of the natives of the extreme Orient. Sacrifice, much less propitiatory sacrifice of such awful character, and *the* Sacrament of the Church, was an incredible mystery. Its necessity could not be understood by those who were asked to accept as a God of love a deity that permitted, much less demanded, the perpetuation of such a doctrine.

The justice, too, of a priesthood being competent to remit sins at the last moment, and place the most wicked on the same level with the most virtuous, is another *difficulty*. That sin should be forgiven under such

conditions, is viewed as a direct incentive to wrong-doing, if it can be finally cancelled whenever it suits the wicked one to become good.

Buddhism is much discussed nowadays ; but it is greatly misunderstood, often, I fear, wilfully misstated. To take any one local or sectarian phase, and the less admirable features of this, as representing the general and fundamental principles is, intentional or not, too often the *suggestio falsi* as well as the *suppressio veri*, if not worse even.

Buddhism teaches that mankind should work out, each for themselves, their own salvation, and rectify the ills caused by fellow-mortals by reasonable human effort.

Superhuman or supernatural aids for the present or for the hereafter appear necessary in the teaching of certain sects, whose dogma is of later development, derived from other than pure Buddhistic sources.

To those who seek a personal salvation, by merit or otherwise, this is not altogether denied ; but to those who attain to the higher ideals something far higher, much less selfish, more noble, is offered. Amongst the educated classes formal prayers and religious observance are less general than amongst the illiterate.

An illustration, one of a series of caricatures, represents an old woman reckoning upon her abacus, in front of a gilt image, her good and evil deeds from the entries in a book open in the lap of the idol.

Some of the Japanese with whom I have talked, quite agree with those Roman Catholics who do not deem the Bible, in its entirety, quite the most fitting book for general family reading ; especially for the young of either sex to pick out certain passages that in any other book would be deemed most highly objectionable ; and think that those who criticise Oriental books, and animadvert on their indecency, should look nearer home first.

The inexperienced, partially educated, young missionary does not appeal with very great effect (often very much wanting in tact) to the educated and subtle-minded natives. Even all but the most illiterate are astute enough to see the propagandist is not well-informed on general subjects, and usually narrow-minded. Besides, the general method of attacking the native faith and ideas, before becoming thoroughly acquainted with what is attacked, displays more than mere want of judgment, and vitiates the efforts. The native knows the missionary is a paid agent—another vital flaw.

After the visit of Xavier (the pupil of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits) the propagandists of Rome had a short but not very brilliant period of success. In consequence of the priests meddling in politics, and something more than mere suspicion of a desire to reduce Japan to a dependency of Rome, or some Roman Catholic European State, the priests were given notice to quit ; but they incited the converts to open rebellion, and forced their way secretly amongst the natives. Rigorous and yet more severe edicts were issued, stringent measures taken, and still the priests persevered, till extreme measures appeared to be the only means to pre-

serve authority, peace, and national independence. The country was closed to the turbulent priests and the truculent Spaniard and other European traders and adventurers. Peace was restored, and it appears to have been maintained. Prosperity permitted the arts and letters to flourish for more than two centuries. California became settled, China partially opened to Western commerce. Merchant shipping whalers began to frequent the Japan seas, shipwrecks occurred, and in time it was deemed expedient to force Japan to open its ports. The thin edge inserted, subsequent events culminated in treaties being forced upon the Japanese, under the guns of ships of war.

The country has been subjected to a great political and social revolution in the thirty years that have elapsed since the revival (enforced) of intercourse with the outer world. Japanese have travelled and been educated; and now missionary societies, Christian associations, etc., are sending their missionaries to Japan in numbers. The Japanese receive these, doubtless, principally on account of the material advantage of numerous instructors chiefly in primary education, submitting to the propaganda tacitly for the sake of the economy.

Some years ago another sweeping measure resulted in the complete separation of Shintô shrines and Buddhist temples and the sequestration of the revenues, the vested interests of those in office being compounded with for pecuniary considerations.

Buddhism and other faiths are now almost completely at the mercy of the people. The sonbreness of our smug self-righteous religionists, Sabbatarians, etc., has little parallel in Japanese religion. Tolerant of the ideas and respecting the feelings of others, the Japanese deny to others the right to dictate to them or force theological dogma upon them unsolicited. In Japan it is quite common to find the members of one household professing various creeds, some of the males Shintôists purely, others of either sex professing different sectarian Buddhist creeds. Even a priest of some of the sects that permit marriage may have as a partner one of a different sect, though this is not very general.

Dispassionate inquiry into all phases of religious philosophies and science is a national characteristic, almost a mania.

The duties of the present, of this life, rather than of a future unrevealed, are urged; and the cruder, coarser ideas of many Western religious sects are entirely absent.

The observance of Shintô rites, festivals, etc., is almost universal, yet does not clash with the fulfilling of Buddhist ceremonials on many occasions during life, whether it is from conviction, or, as is so often the case, "just to make things pleasant all round in the family circle, and in a neighbourly way"; yet the conventionalities and amenities are carried out and respected carefully.

As several of the lectures in this course treat of Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, etc., these have only been briefly alluded to on this occasion;

and it is a great advantage that this is so, as it clears the ground for a lucid conception of this very complicated subject. The esoteric Buddhism of Japan is not at all that of recent exponents and writers. Occultism and charlatanism generally have been rigorously suppressed by the very sensible rulers of old Japan in all time, out of regard for the highest interests of the people.

Time does not permit of entering into the general and minute details of observance and dogma; but for an audience of students of ethical culture, the salient points have been chosen to deal with so far as time permits.

The ideal of duty in this life was a very high and noble one. The materialism and scepticism of China were leavened by the spirituality of India; and the innate artistic instincts and amiable characteristics of the people led them to work out the national idiosyncrasies.

Right valiantly have the Japanese grappled with great problems. Heroic efforts have been made in the present and the past to solve the social and political questions that agitate ourselves. These astute and æsthetic people are far more alive to mental culture and its great ethical value than we can claim to be, much though it may cost our self-conceit to admit it. They know more of us than we know of them; and could we but bring ourselves to see our own social condition as these Easterns see it, the lesson would be worth our while.

In conclusion, these are some of the practical lessons :—

Toleration; respect for the feelings of others; recognition of every one's right to think for themselves; outward conformity to that which is held in public veneration.

Unprejudiced, dispassionate inquiry into all things physical and psychological; no blind faith, but desire for knowledge as a basis, rather than leaning on the judgment of others probably no more capable of judgment.

Sturdy independence of thought, within the limits of non-interference with the freedom and rights of others.

Refraining from forcing dogmatic opinion unwelcome, merely as a personal selfish desire to acquire merit, or from aggressively self-assertive conceit.

Absence of that over-eager desire of personal salvation, even if gained at the expense of others, so common amongst the smug self-righteous of our own land and age.

Recognition of responsibilities and duties, and that there is a loyalty due to the inferior by the superior, reciprocal, not one-sided, as with us.

Refusal to believe in much that is forced upon us by a professional, mercenary religious class, tainted with suspicion of being put forward to support their otherwise untenable claims.

Knowledge that much of the observance of religions we know of, is but the survival of ancient rites, some having an origin that would horrify the orthodox if explained.

A high sense of the dignity of humanity, and that each one should feel this and act accordingly.

Charity to the deserving ; kindness and gentleness to the feeble ; protection to the oppressed ; justice to all.

Unselfish purity in all things,—in thought, speech, deed.

These are some of the lessons to be gleaned from the far East.

[N.B.—The lecture was illustrated with native coloured drawings, brought from Japan by the lecturer ; and by maps kindly lent by R. Bingham, Esq., of Messrs. W. & A. K. Johnston, for this and other lectures at South Place, etc.]

SHINTŌISM (1).

By D. GOH,

Of the Japanese Consulate in London.

THERE are two important considerations which the investigator of any system of religious belief should keep well in mind. In the first place, the true and underlying principle, the essential spirit of the faith, should command primary attention, undisturbed by the observance of any existing ceremonial and ritual by which it is surrounded. For this essential spirit may have become obscured during the course of centuries by the effects of change and partial corruption. The second thought to be kept in view is that religious aspiration, being a spontaneous growth of faith in the human mind, will at all times submit its doctrine to the corrective influence of the intellect, provided its devotees are not the slaves of superstition and dogma. These two considerations are especially important and necessary in dealing with the subject of Shintō, the national religion of Japan.

Shintō is the oldest and perhaps the most simple of all creeds. Having its rise in extreme antiquity, and relying for its substance on the reverence of a barbarous people for the mythical heroes of its own creation, it accordingly lacks the high and spiritual quality which characterizes the creeds of more modern growth. The germ from which it grew existed in hero-worship. Mythology merging into history, and history reaching down to within the bounds of human memory, gave occasion for the establishment of that essential principle of Shintōism, which, as we have pointed out, it should be the aim of the investigator to discuss. That essential principle is ancestor-worship—the foundation and chief characteristic of Shintō.

Although in itself very ancient, its name of Shintō only came into use after the introduction of Buddhism from Korea and China, in the middle of the sixth century after Christ, as a means of distinguishing between the old system and the newly-introduced doctrine. For the two faiths did not long remain sharply differentiated, but soon acquired one from the other certain minor tenets and details of ritual, the mutual exchange of which had the effect of welding them into the one mixed religion called Ryōbu-Shintō. The characters and pronunciation of Shintō are therefore Chinese; and even the earliest works from which information concerning the faith can be gleaned, are written in the language of China.

The meaning of the word Shintō may be best given as "The way of the Genii, or Spirits"; in Japanese, *Kami-no-michi*, Kami simply signifying superiority. Thus the subjects of the Japanese sovereign speak of him

as Kami, and servants address their masters in the same way. There is therefore no definite sense of God in the term; and although there are eight million spirits or Genii in Shintō, there are no gods. Likewise the term Polytheism when applied to this faith is a misnomer, for the Japanese merely believes that the spirit of *man* exists after death in an undeified state; and it is therefore to his own ancestors, from reverential motives, and to the nation's heroes from admiration, that he accords his worship.

Although Shintō is usually classed among religions, it can hardly be said to merit such classification, for the following peculiarities which it possesses give it a place by itself, and reduce it to a system as much political as religious:—

1. Whilst all religious creeds have their sacred books and their moral code, Shintō has neither of these.

2. Whereas no other faith is bound up in one nationality, Shintō can hardly be extended beyond the boundary of Japan, or to others than the subjects of the Mikado.

3. Shintōism does not recognise any distinction between its mythology and the history of the nation.

4. It treats of no future state, beyond uttering the bare dogma of the eternal existence of spirits; and it knows neither a Paradise nor a Hell.

5. Whilst all other religious beliefs are theoretically distinct from political usage and institutions, Shintō embraces the Imperial dynasty of Japan as part of its Godhead, if such a term may be used in this connection.

The consideration of these five points renders impossible the classification of Shintō as one of the religions of the world; yet it may be allowed to stand, in a more limited sense, as a State religion of Japan.

Although it abounds in ceremonies, rituals, and deities of natural objects, such as trees, rivers, rocks, mountains, fire, and wood; and although Hirata has, in his great work on Shintōism, elaborated it almost into a bare idolatry, I do not doubt in my own mind that it has lost its pristine simplicity, and has become corrupted by contact with metaphysical Buddhism and other neighbouring religions. The true element of Shintō, in my opinion, is respect or reverence of ancestors and parents; and granting this, it follows that Filial Piety is its great virtue. Consequently it becomes also the chief characteristic of the Japanese people, and from this quality spring their loyalty and patriotism.

As time progresses, and the light of Western advancement sheds its searching ray over the country's traditions, the credence which is even now, to some extent, given to the national mythology will be withdrawn, and the divinity attaching to the Imperial dynasty will for ever lose hold in the minds of the people. But although this devotion to the head of the State become a thing of the past, as it must, being prompted of ignorance, the loyalty of the masses for their Emperor will never wane. For it is a fact that the majority of Japanese subjects *are* united to the Imperial family—the oldest family in Japan, perhaps in the world.

The very simplicity of Shintōism, as already pointed out, has rendered it so utterly unlike any other faith, that it never has, nor ever will, prove hostile to a religion introduced into its own field, so long as no resistance is offered to the filial and loyal piety and the national virtues of the Land of the Rising Sun. Even when Buddhism had found its way into the State, the Emperor and Empress, in other words, the great Head of Shintō, were actually the first to take an active part in its ceremonies, and became officiating members, at the same time putting administrative power into the hands of Buddhist priests. On the other hand, the Buddhists, from purely diplomatic motives however, adopted the system of ancestor-worship, thereby avoiding friction, inevitable otherwise, with the governmental powers, and making easy converts to their own religion. By these means Buddhism in Japan flourished for a time. Confucianism, however, offered a philosophy more suitable perhaps to Japanese tradition and feeling; for that faith taught in a general way filial and loyal piety as the chief virtue of humanity, and among the higher and more educated classes the doctrine of Confucius was firmly held.

Again, when the Portuguese introduced Christianity, about 300 years ago, they found no difficulty in establishing their Church and carrying on their propaganda. It was not until later, when the preaching of the Jesuits was thought to be directed against the devotion paid to royalty, that the Government prohibited the dissemination of Christian principles. This step of the Japanese authorities led to the outbreak at Shimabara, and hence the Christian religion was interdicted in Japan, and continued to be illegal up to about twenty years ago.

It is my opinion, therefore, that any religion may be established in Japan, provided it does not interfere with the practice of that filial and loyal piety which the State demands.

In September, 1890, the Society of Science held its meeting at Tokyo, and on that occasion one of its members, Mr. H. Kato, President of the Imperial University of that town, spoke upon the subject of Shintōism, saying that it should by no means be regarded as a religion, although it was the most important element in our national thought and feeling. These views took the form of a resolution, which was carried by a majority, consisting of many of the leading men of science. This fact clearly shows the tendency of present thought regarding Shintōism, and points to its future condition as a strong national, but not religious faith.

The subject of Shintōism, or mythology of ancient Japan, and the history of Shintōism, will be found adequately treated by many English authors, notably by Mr. Satow, in the following works: "Shintō," "Handbook to Japan," "The Revival of Pure Shintō," "The Shintō Temple of Ise," "Ancient Japanese Ritual," and also in vols. vii, ix, and x. of "The Asiatic Transactions."

SHINTOISM (2).

BY MRS. BISHOP (ISABELLA BIRD), F.R.S.G.S.

OF the "spiritual centres" of which these lectures treat, *Shintô*, which has fallen to my lot, is certainly among the feeblest; and, never a religion in the highest sense of the word, it has come to be a superstition "ready to vanish away," and deserves our notice chiefly as being, up till to-day, the national religion of the Japanese, one of the most acute, progressive, and materialistic peoples on the face of the earth.

Scholars hesitate to decide whether *Shintô* is or is not "a genuine product of Japanese soil." The Japanese call their ancient religion *Kami no michi* ("The way of the gods"); foreigners adopt the Chinese form of the same, and call it *Shintô*. By *Shintô* is meant the religion which was found spread over Japan when the Buddhist propagandists arrived in the sixth century A.D., and which at the restoration of the Mikado (the so-called Spiritual Emperor) to power in 1868, became the State religion, or, to use our own phraseology, the Established Church. By the term *pure Shintô*, as exhibited in the shrines of Isé and elsewhere, is meant the ancient faith as distinguished from that mixture of it with Buddhism and Confucianism known as *Reigôbu Shintô*, which encounters the traveller everywhere in the shape of gaily decorated lacquer temples, swarming with highly coloured and grotesque divinities carved in wood.

Japanese *Shintô* cosmogony and mythology are one, and in both Japan is the universe. *Shintô* has three legendary mythical periods, during which the islands of Japan and many gods came into being. In the third period Amaterasu, the sun-goddess, was supreme. This "heaven-lighting" divinity, finding that Japan was disturbed by the unending feuds of the earthly gods, among whom Okuniushi, their ruler, could not keep order, despatched Ninigi, a heavenly god, to Higa in central Japan, and compelled the former incompetent divinity to resign his disorderly rule into his hands, permitting him, however, the easier task of ruling the Invisible, while Ninigi and his successors, the Mikados, have continued to rule the Visible. The struggles for supremacy between the gods and their offspring continued to afflict the Visible till 660 B.C., when Jimmu Tenno, the fifth in descent from the sun-goddess, overthrew the Kiushiu rebels, subjugated a large portion of the main island, and settled there with his warriors. This legendary event is the dawn of Japanese history, and the starting-point of Japanese chronology. The 7th of April is fixed as the anniversary of Jimmu Tenno's accession to the throne; he is deified and worshipped in a thousand shrines, and from him the present Mikado claims direct

descent through one hundred and twenty Mikados who have preceded him, the "divine right extending yet farther back through five generations of terrestrial gods, and seven of celestial to the great sun-goddess, from whom he inherits the Japanese regalia—the Mirror, the Sword, and the Stone. The Mikado is the lineal descendant of the gods—nay, he is himself a god, and his palace is a temple. His heavenly origin has been through all historic days the foundation of Japanese government, and it, and the duty of unquestioning obedience to his commands, have been the highest of Shintô dogmas.

Between 97 and 30 B.C., Sugin, the reigning Mikado, and of course a demi-god, appeared as a reformer, called on the people to worship the gods, performed a symbolic purification for the nation, built special shrines for the worship of some of the divinities, removed the mirror, sword and stone from the palace to a shrine built for their custody, and appointed his daughter their priestess. This mirror rested, at least till 1871, in the shrines of Isé, of which I shall speak presently.

In the middle of the sixth century B.C., as is supposed, a great tide of religious change passed over Japan, which has never wholly ebbed, for Buddhist missionaries from Korea proselytized so successfully in high quarters that a decree was issued in the eighth century ordering the erection of two Buddhist temples and a seven-storied pagoda in every province. The singular supremacy of Buddhism, however, is due to a master-stroke of religious policy achieved by a Buddhist priest now known as Kôbô-daishi, who, in the ninth century, in order to gain and retain a hold for his creed over the mass of the people, taught that the Shintô gods were but Japanese manifestations of Buddha, a dogma which reconciled the foreign and native religions, and gave Buddhism several centuries of ascendancy over both Shintô and Confucianism, till it was supplanted about two centuries ago in the intellects of the educated by the Chinese philosophical system of Choo He, which in its turn is being displaced by what is known in Japan as the "English Philosophy," represented by Mill, Herbert Spencer, and others.

The Buddha-izing the old gods, and incorporating the ancient traditions of the divine ancestors and early heroes of the Japanese with the ethical code and dogmas of Buddhism much watered down, produced that jumble before referred to, on which the reigning Mikado bestowed the name of *Reigbun Shintô*, or "two-fold religious doctrine." From that time Buddhist and Shintô priests frequently celebrated their ceremonies in the same temples, the distinctive feature of Shintô, the absence of idols, effigies, and other visible objects of worship disappeared, and the temples became crowded with wooden images of the Shintô hero-gods, alongside of those of Buddha and his disciples, only a very few shrines retaining the simplicity of the ancient faith. In the eighteenth century an attempt was made by a few learned and able men to revive "pure Shintô," and adapt it to those cravings of humanity which Buddhism had partially met, but it

failed, and has resulted mainly in affording materials for the researches of Mr. Satow, Mr. Kemperman, and other European scholars.

At the restoration of the Mikado to temporal power in 1868, Buddhism was practically "disestablished," and Shintô reinstated as the State religion owing to its value as a political engine, but it was impossible to re-introduce many of its long-abandoned usages alongside of Western civilization, and the number of those who regard its divinities with anything like religious reverence is very small.

Since that year the images and the gaudy and sensuous paraphernalia a corrupted Buddhism have been swept out of many of the temples, but the splendour of the lacquer and arabesques remains, as in the temples of Shiba at Yedo and the shrines of Nikko; and the primitive simplicity of the plain wooden structure with the thatched tent-roof and perfectly bare interior, is only seen in the Isé shrines and in some other places.

Three thousand seven hundred gods are known to have shrines. Each hamlet has its special god as well as each shrine, and each god has his annual festival or merry-making, while many have particular days in each month on which people visit their shrines. Every child is taken a month after birth to the shrine of the district in which he is born, and the divinity of the shrine is thenceforward his patron.

On certain occasions the priests assemble in the larger temples and chant certain words to an excruciating musical accompaniment, but this is in no sense "public worship"; and indeed worshippers are seldom if ever admitted within Shintô temples. The god is supposed to be present in the temple dedicated to him, and the worshipper standing outside attracts his attention by pulling the cord of a metal globe, half bell, half rattle, which hangs at the open entrance. The act of worship usually consists in clapping the hands twice and making one or more hasty genuflections, and people make pilgrimages of several hundred miles to the most celebrated shrines to do no more than this, to cast a few of the smallest of bronze coins down upon the temple threshold, and to buy a relic or charm. The festival days of the gods of the larger temples are occasions of much gaiety and splendour. They are celebrated by music, dancing, and processions, in which huge and highly decorated cars take part, on and in which are borne certain sacred emblems covered with gorgeous antique embroideries, which at other times are kept in the temple storehouses. Ancient classical dances or posturings are also given on covered platforms within the temple grounds, and in these a maiden invariably appears dressed in white, and bearing a wand in her hand. The modern Japanese are ignorant of the meaning and history of nearly all the public Shintô ceremonies.

In travels extending for several months in the interior of northern Japan, during which time I lived altogether among the people, I had many opportunities for learning what Shintô is as a household religion. Easy and unexact as it is in public, it is not less so in private. It has no

penances, no deprivations, and no frequent and difficult observances. Certain ceremonies, however, are invariably attended to. In every Shintô house, there is a *Kami-dana* or god shelf, on which is a miniature temple in wood, which contains tablets covered with paper, on which are written the names of the gods in which the household places its trust; and monumental tablets, with the posthumous names of the ancestors and deceased members of the family. Fresh flowers, and specially the leafy twigs of the *deyera japonica* are offered there, together with *saké* (or rice beer), water, and a minute portion of the rice boiled for the food of the household. The glow-worm glimmer of the small lamps which are lit at sunset in front of these shrines, is one of the evening features of the cities of Japan.

Forms of prayer have been published even as late as 1873, but it is regarded as enough to frame a wish without uttering it, and most Shintôists content themselves with turning to the sun in the early morning, rubbing the hands slowly together, and bowing. The directory for prayer is, "Rising early in the morning, wash your face and hands, rinse out the mouth, and cleanse the body. Then turn to the province of Yamato (which contains the shrines of Isé), strike the palms of the hands together, and worship," *i.e.* bow to the ground. It may interest this audience to hear a specimen of one of the most enlightened of the old Shintô prayers, translated by Mr. Satow from a book put forward by the Mikado Jimtôku in the thirteenth century, and which is still used on rare occasions by a few more earnest Shintôists. "From a distance I reverently worship with awe before Ameno Mi-hashira, and Kuni no Mi-hashira (the god and goddess of wind), to whom is consecrated the palace built with stout pillars at Tatsuta no Tachinu in the department of Heguri, in the province of Yamato. I say with awe, Deign to bless me by correcting the unwilling faults which, heard and seen by you, I have committed, by blowing off and clearing away the calamities which evil gods might inflict, by causing me to live long like the hard and lasting rock, and by repeating to the gods of heavenly origin and the gods of earthly origin the petitions which I present every day along with your breath, that they may hear with the sharp-earedness of the forth-galloping colt." It may be remarked that Shintô, unlike most systems, does not inculcate the practice of any form of bribery with the view of securing the good-will of the gods.

Shintô has four distinctive emblems, familiar to every traveller in Japan—the *torii*, the *gohai*, the mirror, and the rope. The *torii*, though sometimes made of stone, properly consists of two barked, but unpainted tree-trunks planted in the ground, on the top of which rests another tree-trunk, with a horizontal beam below. The name means "birds' rest," for on it the fowls *offered*, but not sacrificed, to the gods were accustomed to rest. This emblem stands at the entrance of temple grounds, in front of shrines and sacred trees, and in every place specially associated with the native divinities. In the persecution which was waged against the Romish

failed, and has resulted mainly in affording materials for the researches of Mr. Satow, Mr. Kemperman, and other European scholars.

At the restoration of the Mikado to temporal power in 1868, Buddhism was practically "disestablished," and Shintô reinstated as the State religion owing to its value as a political engine, but it was impossible to re-introduce many of its long-abandoned usages alongside of Western civilization, and the number of those who regard its divinities with anything like religious reverence is very small.

Since that year the images and the gaudy and sensuous paraphernalia a corrupted Buddhism have been swept out of many of the temples, but the splendour of the lacquer and arabesques remains, as in the temples of Shiba at Yedo and the shrines of Nikko; and the primitive simplicity of the plain wooden structure with the thatched tent-roof and perfectly bare interior, is only seen in the Isé shrines and in some other places.

Three thousand seven hundred gods are known to have shrines. Each hamlet has its special god as well as each shrine, and each god has his annual festival or merry-making, while many have particular days in each month on which people visit their shrines. Every child is taken a month after birth to the shrine of the district in which he is born, and the divinity of the shrine is thenceforward his patron.

On certain occasions the priests assemble in the larger temples and chant certain words to an excruciating musical accompaniment, but this is in no sense "public worship"; and indeed worshippers are seldom if ever admitted within Shintô temples. The god is supposed to be present in the temple dedicated to him, and the worshipper standing outside attracts his attention by pulling the cord of a metal globe, half bell, half rattle, which hangs at the open entrance. The act of worship usually consists in clapping the hands twice and making one or more hasty genuflections, and people make pilgrimages of several hundred miles to the most celebrated shrines to do no more than this, to cast a few of the smallest of bronze coins down upon the temple threshold, and to buy a relic or charm. The festival days of the gods of the larger temples are occasions of much gaiety and splendour. They are celebrated by music, dancing, and processions, in which huge and highly decorated cars take part, on and in which are borne certain sacred emblems covered with gorgeous antique embroideries, which at other times are kept in the temple storehouses. Ancient classical dances or posturings are also given on covered platforms within the temple grounds, and in these a maiden invariably appears dressed in white, and bearing a wand in her hand. The modern Japanese are ignorant of the meaning and history of nearly all the public Shintô ceremonies.

In travels extending for several months in the interior of northern Japan, during which time I lived altogether among the people, I had many opportunities for learning what Shintô is as a household religion. Easy and unexacting as it is in public, it is not less so in private. It has no

penances, no deprivations, and no frequent and difficult observances. Certain ceremonies, however, are invariably attended to. In every Shintô house, there is a *Kami-dana* or god shelf, on which is a miniature temple in wood, which contains tablets covered with paper, on which are written the names of the gods in which the household places its trust; and monumental tablets, with the posthumous names of the ancestors and deceased members of the family. Fresh flowers, and specially the leafy twigs of the *clevera japonica* are offered there, together with *saké* (or rice beer), water, and a minute portion of the rice boiled for the food of the household. The glow-worm glimmer of the small lamps which are lit at sunset in front of these shrines, is one of the evening features of the cities of Japan.

Forms of prayer have been published even as late as 1873, but it is regarded as enough to frame a wish without uttering it, and most Shintôists content themselves with turning to the sun in the early morning, rubbing the hands slowly together, and bowing. The directory for prayer is, "Rising early in the morning, wash your face and hands, rinse out the mouth, and cleanse the body. Then turn to the province of Yamato (which contains the shrines of Isé), strike the palms of the hands together, and worship," *i.e.* bow to the ground. It may interest this audience to hear a specimen of one of the most enlightened of the old Shintô prayers, translated by Mr. Satow from a book put forward by the Mikado Jimtôku in the thirteenth century, and which is still used on rare occasions by a few more earnest Shintôists. "From a distance I reverently worship with awe before Ameno Mi-hashira, and Kuni no Mi-hashira (the god and goddess of wind), to whom is consecrated the palace built with stout pillars at Tatsuta no Tachinu in the department of Heguri, in the province of Yamato. I say with awe, Deign to bless me by correcting the unwilling faults which, heard and seen by you, I have committed, by blowing off and clearing away the calamities which evil gods might inflict, by causing me to live long like the hard and lasting rock, and by repeating to the gods of heavenly origin and the gods of earthly origin the petitions which I present every day along with your breath, that they may hear with the sharp-earedness of the forth-galloping colt." It may be remarked that Shintô, unlike most systems, does not inculcate the practice of any form of bribery with the view of securing the good-will of the gods.

Shintô has four distinctive emblems, familiar to every traveller in Japan—the *torii*, the *gohéi*, the mirror, and the rope. The *torii*, though sometimes made of stone, properly consists of two barked, but unpainted tree-trunks planted in the ground, on the top of which rests another tree-trunk, with a horizontal beam below. The name means "birds' rest," for on it the fowls *offered*, but not sacrificed, to the gods were accustomed to rest. This emblem stands at the entrance of temple grounds, in front of shrines and sacred trees, and in every place specially associated with the native divinities. In the persecution which was waged against the Romish

Christians some time ago, the token of recantation required was that they should pass under the *torii*. In some places, as at the great Temple of the Fox at Fushima, there are avenues composed of several hundreds of these, and whether large or small, the *torii* is a favourite *ex voto*.

The *gohei* is a slim wand of unpainted wood, with two long pieces of paper notched alternately on opposite sides depending from it. These represent offerings of rough and white cloth, which were supposed to have the effect of attracting the gods to the place where they were offered, but have come to be popularly regarded as gods themselves. Indeed, they seem to resemble the white wands with dependent shavings, which are worshipped by the Ainos of Yezo, who are by many regarded as the remnant of the aborigines of Japan.

In many Shintô temples a circular steel mirror is the only object, and even this is only exposed to view where for some time Shintô has been jumbled up with Buddhism. Much ingenious rubbish has been devised to account for the presence of this emblem, and a few fanciful Western writers have chosen to regard it as symbolizing Truth, but the plain fact is that every such mirror is a copy of that which has rested at Isé for nearly two thousand years, which the sun-goddess presented to Ninigi as an emblem of herself when she sent him down to govern the world. The polished surface is neither a mirror of truth nor of the human soul, but is simply a very intelligible symbol of a rude compound of nature and myth worship, of nature as the sun, deified and personified as the myth Amaterasu or the "sun-goddess."

The last emblem, also of legendary origin, is a rope of rice straw, varying in thickness from the heavy cable which often hangs across a *torii*, or temple entrance, to that no thicker than a finger, which is suspended across house doors or surrounds sacred trees, and which has straw tassels or strips of white paper dangling from it.

The true Shintô temple, or shrine, is of unpainted wood, and the tent-like roof is thickly thatched. The floor is covered with thick rice-straw mats, let into wooden frames. There are no ornaments, idols, effigies, or ecclesiastical paraphernalia of any kind. Plain *gohei* and minute offerings of saké, rice, and other vegetable food on unlacquered wooden trays, and some sprigs of the evergreen *cleyera japonica* alone denote the use of the barren temple of a barren creed. In a receptacle behind there is a case only exposed to view on the day of the annual festival, and this is said to contain the spirit of the deity to whom the temple is dedicated, "the august spirit substitute."

There are about ninety-eight thousand Shintô shrines in Japan, and twenty thousand priests or shrine-keepers, who may be regarded as paid officials of the government. These are allowed to marry, and do not shave their heads. There is an appropriation of £58,000 annually for the Shintô religion. In the restored order the department which dealt with the affairs of the earthly and heavenly gods held the highest place in the

scale of official precedence ; but in 1877, or in less than ten years, it sank by "leaps and bounds" to the indignity of being transferred to a sub-department of the Ministry of the Interior !

The traveller in Japan meets continually with bands of pilgrims on their way to Isé, the centre of Shintō, in the province of Yamato in Central Japan. Dismiss from your minds the idea of austerity, penance, privation, worship, sanctity, and vows, which the word pilgrimage conjures up. "A pilgrimage" to Isé is the greatest frolic and holiday of the year or the lifetime, a prolonged picnic, a vast merry-making. In spring the roads are thronged with bands of girls and companies of men in holiday costume, singing and laughing ; bowing to every high hill and every large tree, visiting theatres and shows ; and after throwing their coins on the white cloth in front of the Isé temples, surrendering themselves to the pleasures of Yamada, a city abounding in vicious attractions.

The two temples of Isé, the Gekū and the Naiku, called by a name which signifies "the two great divine palaces," are the cradle and kernel of Shintō ; and are to Shintōists, even in the irreligious present, in a slight degree something of what Mecca is to Mussulmans, and the Holy Places of Jerusalem to Greeks and Latins. There is no time of the year in which there is an absolute cessation of pilgrims, and though the artisans of Tōkiyō now think it possible to gain a livelihood without beseeching the protection of the Isé deities, and the shopboys of the trading cities no longer beg their way to Yamada in search of the Isé charms ; the credulous and simple peasant cannot yet feel safe without the paper ticket inscribed with the name Ten-shōkō-daijin (the principal deity of Isé), which is obtainable only at the Isé shrines. Relics of Isé are in every house ; the Isé deities are at the head of the national Pantheon ; the pilgrimage to Isé is an episode in the life of every Shintōist ; and from north to south thousands of heads are daily bowed in the direction of "The Divine Palaces of the most holy gods of Isé."

Allusion has been previously made to the fact that in every Japanese household there is a "shelf for gods," on which is a shrine containing paper tickets, on which the names of various gods are written, one of which is always Ten-shōkō-daijin. This special ticket is supposed to contain between two thin slips some shavings of the wands used by the priests of Isé at the two annual festivals, and is able to protect its possessor from misfortune for half a year, at the end of which time the *o-harai*, as it is called, ought to be changed for a new one ; but modern carelessness is content to renew the charm once in two or three years or longer. The old tickets ought to be burned or cast into a river or the sea, but are usually employed to heat the bath used by the maiden priestesses, so-called after their posture dances at the annual festival of the patron god of any locality. The fact of the universal distribution of these *o-harai* connects every family in Japan with the Isé shrines and Shintō superstition. Up to 1868, the *o-harai* were hawked about Japan, but the government subsequently pro-

hibited the practice, and now they can only be obtained at the Isé shrines themselves, or at certain accredited agencies.

The two groups of shrines are three miles and a half from each other, at Furuichi and Yamato, which towns are, for Japan, marvels of solid and picturesque building, and are made up chiefly of inns, tea-houses, shops for the sale of *ex votos* and Shintô toys and relics, and places of vicious attractions. The shrines are exact copies of each other, and both stand in the midst of ancient cryptomeria, each stately tree in Shintô fancy worthy to be a god; but it is the camphor groves, the finest in Japan, covering the extensive and broken grounds with their dark and unique magnificence, which so impress a stranger as to make him forget for a moment the bareness and meanness of the shrines which they overshadow.

The grand entrance to the Gekû shrine is reached from Yamato by crossing a handsome bridge over the river Izuzu, in which the pilgrims wash their hands before going to the temple. On the other side is a wide space enclosed by stone-faced banks. On the right there is a building used by the temple attendants, where fragments of the wood used for the shrines, packets of the rice offered to the gods, and other charms are sold. The entrance to the actual temple grounds is under a massive *torii*. These grounds are of great extent, and contain hills, ravines, groves, and streams. Broad and finely-gravelled roads with granite margins and massive stone lanterns intersect them, and their *torii* stone bridges, stone staircases, and stone-faced embankments are all on a grand scale and in perfect repair. Within the entrance are some plain buildings, one of which is occupied by several temple attendants dressed in white silk, whose business it is to sell the *o-karai* to all comers. Heavy curtains with the Mikado's crest upon them, draped over the entrance, may be taken as indicating that Shintô is under "State" patronage.

Passing through stately groves by a stately road, and under another stately *torii*, the visitor reaches the famous Gekû shrine, but to be stricken by a pang of intense disappointment, for he is suddenly brought up by a great but utterly unimposing oblong enclosure of neatly planed wood—the upright posts, which are nine feet high, being planted at distances of six feet, and the intervals filled up with closely fitting and very heavy planking laid horizontally. The enclosure rests on a platform of broken stone raised on a stone embankment three feet high. It measures 247 by 339 feet. It has five entrances, four of which are always closed by solid gates, while the fifth is a *torii*, with a high wooden screen at a distance of seventy-six feet from it in front. Within the *torii* is a wooden gateway with a thatched roof, but a curtain with the Mikado's crest conceals all view of the interior court. It is in front of this gateway that the pilgrims from every part of Japan throw down their copper coins upon a white cloth. Then they bow a few times, and depart satisfied.

Three courts with *torii* and thatched gateways are contained within this outer enclosure, the central one, an area of 134 feet by 131, being sur-

rounded by a very stout palisade. It must be observed that there is no access, except on the festival day, even into the first enclosure, but a good view is obtained from a bank on the west side. This innermost enclosure contains the *shōden* or shrine of the gods, a building thirty-four feet long by eighteen wide, mounted on a platform raised on posts six feet high. A balcony three feet wide runs round the building, and is covered by the eaves of the roof, which is finely thatched with bark to the depth of a foot. This *shōden*, like all else, is of planed wood, without ornament. It contains four boxes of unpainted wood, furnished with white handles and covered with what is said to be white silk. In each box is a mirror wrapped in a brocade bag. This is all, the kernel of the Shintō "Holy of Holies." These mirrors are never seen, and even the boxes which contain them are covered with curtains of coarse silk when the shrines are open on festival days. Two treasures stand on the right and left of the *shōden*, and contain silken stuffs, silk fibre, and saddling for the sacred horses, which are usually albinos. The impression produced by a visit to Isé is akin to that made upon the minds of those who have made the deepest researches into Shintō—that there is nothing; and that all things, even the stately avenues of the Gekō shrine, lead to—NOTHING! Glorious are the camphor groves of Isé, and bright the skies of Yamato; but no sunshine can light the awful melancholy of the unutterable emptiness of the holiest places of Shintō.

Having briefly traced Shintō from remote antiquity to the Isé shrines, its claims to be a religion and a "spiritual centre" remain to be as briefly considered. It must be remembered that Shintō has been for twelve centuries in close contact with Buddhism; and, corrupt and degenerate as Japanese Buddhism is, the lotus blossom in its temples still symbolizes righteousness; and the pictured torments of its many hells still assert that moral evil perpetuates itself beyond the grave. Christianity also, which promises to be an important element in the religious future of Japan, has touched Shintō at many points during many years with its lofty teaching, that "pure religion before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." It does not appear, however, that either Buddhism or Christianity has, in an ethical sense, influenced the native faith. "Sin" is stated on high authority to be "the transgression of the law," and "where no law is there is no transgression." Shintō has no law, and consequently no sin. It has no ethical code. Naotaore, its modern exponent and revivalist, emphatically states that "to have acquired the knowledge that there is no *michi* (ethics) to be practised and learned is really to have learned to practise the way of the gods." This lack of moral teaching makes it powerless as a religion, even among a people of such easy morals as the Japanese. Mr. Mori, the late Minister of the Interior, gives it as his opinion that "the leading idea of Shintō is a reverential feeling towards the dead." Kaempfer, one of the most painstaking and accurate of observers, wrote thus, after

elaborate investigations: "The whole system of Shintô is so mean and simple, that besides a heap of fabulous and romantic stories of their gods, demi-gods, and heroes, their divines have nothing wherewith to satisfy the inquiries of curious persons about the nature and essences of their gods, about their power and government, about the future state of the soul, and such other essential points whereof other heathen systems are not altogether silent."

There is no teaching concerning a future state, no hell or purgatory for bad men, or heaven for good men. A vague assumption of the immortality of the soul arising out of a vague belief in the immortality of the gods, and a rude Valhalla of victories and feasting in the company of ancestors and heroes of the past, constitute the vague future of the Shintôist. Shintô has no worship properly so called, no sacrifices, no idol worship, and no priest-craft. The intervention of a priest is not ordinarily needed, for there are no specially merciless deities to propitiate, no terrors of hell to avert, and both sexes are capable of offering prayers. Such is the negative side. Its claim to be a religion rests almost solely on its deification of heroes, emperors, and great men, and of sundry forces and objects in nature; on its inculcating reverence for ancestors and imitation of their worthy deeds; and on its recognition of certain national ceremonial defilements and forms of purification.

The number of its deities is practically unlimited, or "eight millions," and includes heroes, rivers, mountains, waterfalls, and big trees. There are gods of all things—of learning, happiness, protection of human abodes, of harvest, of horse-shoes, of the gate, the well, the kitchen fireplace, and everything else to which superstitions of unknown origin are attached by the ignorant; but to none of these gods are high or noble qualities attributed, far less any of those which we regard as the "attributes" of deity. The best which can be said of the Shintô gods is that their worship has never been associated with bloody sacrifices or cruel or immoral rites. Of the gods of this vast Pantheon, many are merely local divinities, but the worship of the gods of Isé, the "goddess of Food" and the "sun goddess" of the "Thousand-armed Kwanyon," the goddess of "Mercy," whose *cultus* was brought from China by the Buddhist propagandists; of Daikoku, the god of wealth; and of Binzuru, the medicine god, is universal in the empire. Binzuru, the medicine god, is usually a red lacquet figure of a man seated, and much defaced by the rubbings of centuries. To any specially celebrated image of Binzuru the afflicted make pilgrimages, rub the afflicted part of their own persons and the corresponding part of the god, and then rub themselves again. Daikoku is the prince of household gods. No family in Japan is without his image. This god, who leads all men, and possibly fools most, is represented as jolly and roguish-looking. He is short and stout, wears a cap like the cap of Liberty, is seated on rice-bags, holds a mallet in his right hand, and with his left clutches the mouth of a sack which he carries over his shoulder. All who have their living to make incessantly propitiate Daikoku; he is never with-

out offerings and incense, and if there be a shadow of intensity in Shintō devotion, it is thrown into his worship.

Infallibility on the part of the head of a State, in virtue of his Divine descent, was a convenient doctrine for political purposes in Japan, but cannot stand as an institution of government against the rapidly spreading tide of political ideas from Europe. I am almost inclined to speak of Shintō as the State religion in the past tense, for the hundred and twenty-first Mikado has voluntarily abdicated his absolute sovereignty, the gift of the sun-goddess, and, in promulgating a constitution for the Japanese Empire, has descended into the ranks of constitutional rulers. In this descent Shintō must receive its deathblow. As a religion, anyhow, it is nearly extinct. Western science has upset its cosmogony, and Western philosophy its mythology; it survives as a bundle of harmless superstitions, a fading folk-lore, fondly clung to as such by the unenlightened peasantry. Without a ritual, a moral code, or the rudest elements of a creed; with its lack of sensuousness, as well as of teachings regarding a future state, it never had power as a spiritual centre, and yielded easily to the ascendancy of Buddhism. It is hollow and empty, it has nothing in it to stir man's deepest nature. It appeals to no instincts of good or evil, and promises no definite destiny, and all attempts to resuscitate it, either as a bulwark against Christianity or as a substitute for Buddhism, must inevitably fail. In the words of a poet—

"It shall pass as a camp that is struck, as a tent that is gathered and gone,
From the sands that were lamp-lit at eve, and at morning are level and lone."

These notes are the merest outline of Shintō, but the most elaborate treatise could do no more than successfully demonstrate its utter emptiness of all that to our ideas constitutes religion, and excite surprise that it should still retain even a nominal place among a people so quick-witted as the Japanese.

This easiest and least exacting of religions is vanishing away; and now—what will satisfy the spiritual cravings which Buddhism and Christianity have awakened, and who will mould the religious future of Japan? Will it be the ascetic and philosophic Sakyamuni, dead for two thousand years, and serene for ever in his golden shrine, offering a passionless nonentity as the goal of righteousness? or will it be Jesus the crucified Nazarene, holding in His pierced hands the gift of an immortality of consecrated activities, the best hope of the weary ages—to whom, as the Crowned and Risen Christ, through centuries of slow and painful progress, all Christendom has bent the adoring knee, and who shall yet reign in righteousness, King of kings and Lord of lords?

HINDUISM.

BY SIR ALFRED LYALL.

POPULAR Hinduism, which is the subject of this article, is the religion of some 170 millions of the inhabitants of India; and the word Hindu means, not only an Indian by birth, but also and more particularly, a person belonging to this religion. It is of course impossible to give in a few pages more than an outline of the general features and character of so great a system of beliefs and practices.

To begin with a very loose and broad definition, Hinduism may be described roughly as the religion of all the people who accept the Brahmanic scriptures—the sacred books and traditions—as orthodox and inspired; who adore the Brahmanic gods, their principal incarnations and their symbolic manifestations; who venerate the cow, observe certain rules of caste, in regard to marriage and the sharing of food, follow a ritual prescribed by the Brahmins, and go to that priesthood for all the essential forms and ceremonies connected with birth, matrimony, or death. This is the general agreement; these are the binding rules which unite the vast population which is called Hindu; but we must nevertheless be cautious about taking the word Hindu to mean, like the word Mahomedan, a formal creed or a uniform faith. For the Hindus are divided and marked off into manifold interior diversities of worship and popular superstitions, belonging to different ages and different grades of their society; they have a great Pantheon of deities; they have an extensive mythology; their ritual varies incessantly with the places at which it is practised and the gods to which it is addressed.

The first thing, then, to bear in mind is that *Hinduism* includes many kinds and modes of worship addressed to an immense number of gods, estimated by millions, of whom the superior class and the most famous are Brahmanic and orthodox, whom every one more or less recognises; while the inferior and far more numerous class includes a great many deities, local, tribal, and connected with certain sects and even professions. All these deities, with the addition of a host of demigods, divine saints or heroes, and miraculous personages generally, are in one sense below and separate from the chief divinities of Brahmanic Hinduism, and yet more or less remotely connected with them.

The second thing to remember is that Hinduism has another characteristic, one well known as belonging to almost all early religions; it has a set of outward forms and fables for the crowd and a different inner meaning and significance for the initiated,—for all those who inquire

further, who are not content to remain in the outer courts of the temple. The outer shape is a very fantastic polytheism, the worship of innumerable divine beings, through their images and emblems, by a ritual that is often not very pure. The inner meaning and explanation is what is called Pantheism; that is, the doctrine that all the countless deities, and all the great forces and operations of nature, such as the wind, the rivers, the earthquakes, the pestilences, are merely direct manifestations of the all-pervading divine energy, which shows itself in numberless forms and manners. They hold that man himself is but the vessel which contains the divine particle, which gives thought and utterance to visible humanity; their doctrine is that God is substantially identical with Nature, so that in worshipping Nature, whether animate or inanimate, you actually worship God, and in adoring the idol you show reverence to the symbol or emblem of divinity. This is the Hindu system of explaining all natural works and wonders, of defending the direct worship of the elements, or of animals, or even of sticks and stones, and of justifying idolatry as a help to popular devotion. And this explanation is universally accepted by all intelligent Hindus. A still deeper secret is that the whole world as perceived by our senses is an illusion.

The character of Hinduism may be to a great degree explained by the political condition and history of the country in which it has grown up. The Indian population is a vast composite mass of various tribes and nations in different stages of civilization, living under diverse forms of government. Over this population, as a whole, no single ruler, civil or religious, not even the Brahmanic priesthood, has ever acquired complete control. This accounts for much of the loose organization of the religion. The absence of law or orderly arrangement or definite form.

Our first attempt to examine Hinduism only shows us at the first glance a tangled jungle of disorderly superstitions; we see demons, demi-gods and deified persons; we see household gods, tribal gods, local gods, universal gods, with their countless shrines and temples and their rites of every sort and fashion; we see deities who abhor a fly's death and deities who are still supposed to delight in human victims, and gods who will have neither sacrifice nor burnt offering; we see in short a kind of religious chaos. We have been so much accustomed in Europe to associate any great religion with the idea of a church, and of regular formal creeds, that we find it hard to realize the existence of an ancient religion, still alive and powerful, which is on the surface a mere troubled sea, driven to and fro by the winds of boundless credulity and grotesque invention.

These preliminary remarks may serve to explain why it is so difficult for me to give in the course of a single essay any definite, orderly and easily comprehensible account of popular Hinduism as it actually prevails in India. Its character is, as has been said, astonishing variety in the objects of worship and in the manner of worshipping; and, moreover, these things differ in different parts of the country, while changes are constantly going on. In

such a system, where the most unvarnished idolatry is found mixed up more or less with a deep philosophy, it would be impossible to classify accurately all its features; so that no more than general notions and a rough outline can be here given.

To begin, then, all Hindu life falls generally within the framework of caste. I mean that every Hindu belongs, as such, to some one of the very numerous groups into which the whole multitude is sorted out. But caste is not the exact translation of the Indian term; it is an European word (Portuguese) applied rather broadly to these separate groups or circles, of which the members all eat and intermarry with each other, and as a rule do not marry with outsiders. Caste, however, is much more exactly connected with differences of race or profession than with diversities of religious belief, although the laws of caste, like all other laws among Hindus, are settled and expounded by Brahmins.

Into the question of the origin and working of the system of caste I cannot now enter, beyond referring to the four great caste divisions, which are mentioned in the sacred books. The 1st is the Brahmanic or priestly caste; the 2nd consists of warriors; the 3rd of merchants; and the 4th, called *Sudras*, comprise all other miscellaneous subdivisions of Hindus. But of these only the Brahmins now represent a real caste or separate group in Hindu Society; the others do not actually exist, are not practically in use, as distinct classes of the people; for the mass of the Hindu population is divided into a very great number of castes, sects, and tribes. The Brahmin, however, does exist as a separate and superior caste; he is the Levite of India. I mean that the Brahmins are the hereditary possessors and guardians of all sacred learning and tradition. The Brahmin is the priest whose offices are indispensable at all the important moments of life,—at birth, marriage, and funeral; and it is the Brahmanic caste that has invented and keeps up the elaborate ceremonial and apparatus of the religion, and that studies and expounds the Hindu scriptures. If, then, we must attempt some preliminary definition of Hinduism, we may venture to call it the collection of rites, worships, beliefs, traditions, and mythologies that are sanctioned by the sacred books and ordinances of the Brahmins and are propagated by Brahmanic teaching. And a Hindu is one who generally follows the rules of conduct and ceremonial thus laid down for him, particularly regarding food and marriage, and the adoration of the gods.

I will not do more than touch upon the Brahmanic scriptures. The Vedas are the earliest and most sacred books, of universal authority and great antiquity. Vedic literature, according to the summary given by Sir Monier Williams, consists of three divisions—Texts and Metrical Hymns; Rules of Ritual and Worship; Mystical Doctrines. The Vedas were revealed to the Rishis or inspired saints, and by them committed to writing. The Hindu religion, as it is now represented and practised, is, I believe, mainly founded on the Puranas, a word which means ancient

writings. These writings give an account of the various gods of Hinduism and certain legends of the world's creation and its successive ages. I must now attempt to give some description—it will be very imperfect—of the divinities worshipped by the Hindus. There are, as is generally known, three supreme gods: Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; and we may conceive these three mightiest deities at the summit and highest pinnacles of the whole fabric; and below them, sometimes proceeding out of them as incarnations or re-appearances, sometimes connected with them as manifestations or symbols, or as their wives and subordinate attendants, a whole host of minor deities, said to be in all three hundred millions. Nothing like this number are actually worshipped; but beside the regular and traditional gods there is certainly an innumerable crowd of demi-gods and deified people, to whom I will go back again presently.

I will first take the great Triad of Brahma, Vishnu and Siva. Of Brahma, there is little to say. He is usually described as the Creator, the Self-existent; and it is supposed that he stands for the original creative intelligence which produced the visible universe, so to speak, out of nothing. But he is rather a philosophic conception, made by way of obtaining a starting-point for the whole system, more than a divinity who has any further concern in the operation of the machinery that has been set in motion by his will. His influence is thus too remote, and his functions are too vague, to impress the popular imagination, and as a matter of fact he has very few temples. The whole multitude of devout orthodox Hindus is divided generally into worshippers of Vishnu, and worshippers of Siva, but these two great divisions bear no more love to each other than sects usually do. Vishnu is a more important and wide-ruling deity, representing several great and far-spread religious ideas. He is the supreme preserver of things, and his wife, Lakshmi typifies plenty and prosperity. In his highest form he is pictured as in a state of blissful repose and you may here notice that the supreme type of all the highest Hindu divinities is tranquillity, not activity. Vishnu in repose shadows forth the Eternal Spirit; but, unlike Brahma, Vishnu can be awakened by the earnest prayers and oblations of men, or of the minor gods, and can be induced to descend into the world and to set things right at critical moments. These descents are his famous incarnations, when he has come embodied in some form, and has achieved great feats, or worked great miracles. His most celebrated embodiments were Rana and Krishna. Rana is a famous legendary warrior—the hero of the great epic poem of India. Krishna is a god whose worship is in the highest repute in certain parts of India. It must be clearly borne in mind that this theory of divine embodiment is one of the most important and effective doctrines of Hinduism; it binds together various parts of the religion, connecting the higher with the lower ideas, and bringing the gods constantly down from heaven to take part in human affairs. Whenever it became expedient to account for the marvellous feats of some great hero, the explanation has been that he was possessed by the great god Vishnu,

who was acting under his form ; and thus the god has constantly appeared as a man among men, to his great glorification. But Vishnu has also passed into the bodies of animals : into the lion, the boar, the fish, and the tortoise. Now this sort of tradition will first strike you as full of crazy inconsistencies. You hear that the divine spirit has animated a magnificent warrior or a wonder-working saint, and you admit that the conception is rational and not undignified. When you are told that the same great god passed into a fish and a tortoise, and is worshipped under that form, you think the belief absurd and irrational. But in the first place you must bear in mind that the underlying idea running through all these embodiments is Pantheism ; the divine spirit is everywhere immanent and active in an insect as much as in Alexander the Great. And in the second place the Brahmans had very special and practical reasons for recognising the appearance of Vishnu in certain animal shapes. It is to be remembered that the Brahmanic religion has always been making converts of the numerous non-Hindu tribes and clans in the outlying tracts, in the hills and forests of India. These were the aboriginal peoples, who practised rude, fetish-like worship of things and animals. And there is good cause for supposing that one principal method of amalgamating these outside gentiles with the general congregation of Hindus, was by admitting their gods, properly refined and improved and explained, into the Hindu Pantheon. This seems to have been effected, in many cases, by identifying their objects of worship as embodiments of Vishnu. I myself know of one instance where the boar was worshipped by a tribe of wild hillmen in Central India. Now the boar is one of Vishnu's famous incarnations ; and as the hillmen became Hinduized, it was quite natural and obvious that Vishnu should be discovered in the animal ; so that the hillmen had only to understand that they had been worshipping the great god unawares. This tribe was rapidly passing into Hinduism under my eyes. Nor was this by any means a deliberate method of deluding or mystifying the aborigines. The Brahmans accepted the fact that the thing or creature worshipped had about it some marvellous or formidable qualities—that it was rightly adored or propitiated ; they only went a step behind and above the mere outside worship, and explained that these qualities betokened some special divine power or attribute, and thus signified the presence of the god in a new form. And they would also say, if pressed, that the god himself was merely a visible and striking manifestation of the hidden divine energy that animates everything. In the same manner all the great heroes and saints would be shown to be disguises or appearances put on by Vishnu for the purpose of playing some great part upon the stage of the visible world.

I have mentioned Krishna and Rana, and there are many other names. I remember that in the mutiny, when a Mahomedan led a force against us, and had some success at first, a Rajpoot, recounting his feats, said that he must be an embodiment of Krishna ; the notion in one shape or another is very old and widespread. You will recollect that when the Homeric

gods take part in a battle, they are apt to assume the form of some warriors, and the legends of all nations are full of such miraculous figures appearing to save or defend their worshippers. Krishna, again, has at least ten celebrated incarnations of his own, under which he is separately worshipped at certain famous shrines. Juggernáth, of whose car you have heard, is one of his names. His extreme devotees consecrate to him their soul, their body and their goods; but I am afraid that his example, as a remarkably sportive and amorous deity, has led to very loose practices among some sections of his worshippers.

Siva represents a different principle, and stands out in strong contrast to Vishnu. He is the destroyer and rebuilders of the various forms of life. He has charge of the whole circle of animated existence, the incessant round of births and deaths in which all nature eternally revolves. He is not known through embodiment, like Vishnu, but through his tremendous attributes and their symbols; he is made manifest through the great natural forces of destruction and reproduction. He brings to life and he brings to death, and the plagues and diseases like small pox, which sweep away thousands, are his agencies. Nature, as we know, makes and breaks a thousand types, and cares nothing for the amazing waste that goes on in creation. She is always producing and destroying in a mysterious, reckless, inexorable sort of way. Siva presides over this terrible machinery, which is constantly sweeping away millions of creatures and replacing them by others. The aim of the ordinary crowd of Siva's worshippers is to propitiate his power; the ambition of a few is to obtain a share of it.

It is under Siva's patronage that are practised the severe austerities and feats of self-mortification, or even self-mutilation by iron hooks, and endurance of pain and starvation, rigid postures, fasting and solitary meditation. By these practices an unflinching *soutri* may at last obtain miraculous powers, and may even compel the gods to obey him. Most of the brotherhoods or orders of Indian devotees, fakirs, or vagrant Hindu dervishes, who sometimes disdain clothing and wander all over India, are worshippers of Siva, who is also the god in whose temples thousands of animals are sacrificed, while it is supposed that even human sacrifices would not distress him. Here again it is now generally conjectured that just as Vishnu annexed and absorbed the benignant, heroic or merely marvellous gods of the non-Brahmanic tribes, so the rude and cruel rites of the aborigines, the more terrible apparitions, demons, and goblins of the ruder races, were assigned—as these races became Hinduized—to Siva or to his manifestations, or to Siva's consort and attendant subordinate deities.

I have now attempted very imperfectly to explain the great triad of Hinduism—Brahma, Vishnu and Siva. It is to be observed that they have an inner and an outer meaning—a popular shape and a mystic interpretation. They represent the principle which runs like a spinal cord right through all Hinduism, connecting the higher intelligent religions with the lower beliefs. At the top we have these deities representing the intellectual and abstract

notions of the religion; they are mysterious allegorical figures which suggest and personify the secrets of Nature, and the unchanging, pitiless laws of Nature's action—the malignant and benignant influences, the all-pervading energy they preside over, the eternal succession of life and death, as of day and night. Then comes the ordinary popular worship of the same deities—of their embodiments, manifestations and symbols, and at the bottom we have Vishnu and Siva drawing to themselves and assimilating the fierce, foolish or indecent customs and worships of the primitive deities, of animals, of rivers and mountains, of stocks and stones.

But I must go on to explain that beside the three great gods and their most famous incarnations or manifestations, there is a vast crowd of local gods, who may or may not be directly attached to the great Three. There are also impersonations, which we shall call allegorical, of such things as Fortune, War, Courage; a whole class of events and chances, in which mankind is deeply interested, is figured by a god as in pagan antiquity. There is also the elemental worship of the great objects of Nature—the sun and moon, and of the rain and the wind, thinly disguised under the names of deities. The great rivers and the high mountain peaks are obvious points of direct adoration; the thing itself is worshipped; the river is a living and moving force, replete with divine energy; the mountain is a huge manifestation of power. There is also a very numerous and miscellaneous army of saints and martyrs, heroes and sages, who have been locally distinguished and have been deified or canonized by popular wonder or awe; they have produced a deep impression on the mind of the people by piety, valour, misfortune, austerity or preaching. They are declared to have worked miracles during their lives, and to have shown signs of being possessed of special divine power or virtue, for good or for evil. In fact, the worship of the elder or classic gods is only a portion of the popular religion of the country. Men are driven by their feeling of the awfulness of invisible power surrounding them to propitiate every strange shape or striking natural object; their piety leads them to pay reverence to useful animals, and even to the implements of a profitable trade. The people have set up tutelary deities without number, who watch over the interests of separate classes or callings, and who are served by rites peculiar to their shrines, and there is a continual addition made in the more remote districts to the number of what I may call canonized saints, who gradually rise to be local gods.

My own view regarding the origin and growth of a great many of these local deities is this. It is drawn from some actual observation. I believe that the practice of turning wonderful men into gods goes on incessantly in India,—that the habit of ascribing divine possession to remarkable personages has been for ages almost universal among primitive races and superstitious peoples, and consequently that a very large number of the gods of Hinduism have been developed, so to speak, out of humanity. I mean that if you could trace back their authentic history, and get at the kernel of truth that lies at the bottom of almost all legends, you would find that

the beginning of the whole story was that some man was famous during his life-time, was therefore worshipped after his death, that his worship became popular and spread, until his human origin was forgotten or concealed, and that he thus became converted or promoted into the full honours of divinity. No one would deny the strong influence of Nature-worship,—of the worship of the stars, the sea, the darkness and dawn, etc. Nevertheless all the most impressive figures that stand out in the front rank of popular Hinduism appear to me to have been gradually formed in the manner I have said; they are magnified supernatural men. We can, I think, trace a series of beliefs which support this conjecture. There is first the general worship of the dead and of ghosts, which is found among all the primitive races of India; then comes the particular worship of dead men who have been famous; then the worship of these famous men as local gods; and lastly, the recognition of these local gods as forms or appearances of the supreme gods of Hinduism. The tragedy of a fierce or painful life, the mystery of death, and the immense attraction to men of striking character or exploits, seem to me to account for the origin and formation of a great many divinities. We find that the ancient Christian fathers Tertullian and St. Augustine vehemently declared in their writings against paganism, that all the heathen gods were originally men to whom divine honours had been paid, and it is somewhere said that the great idol of the pagans, of classic polytheism, was deified humanity.

To sum up briefly, you have at the summit the great triad Brahma Vishnu and Siva, with their consorts, the deities who create and uphold the visible universe—then you have them reappearing in various embodiments, emblems and manifestations. Then we may take the adoration of deities personifying the worship of remarkable natural objects. Add the gods of mythology, of heroic legend, and of the great national epics. And we must also count a certain number of deities who preside over callings, possessions and localities—whose worship is famous at certain places like the ancient Diana at Ephesus. When we get beyond this very rough and imperfect classification, I myself am unable to put the rest of the religious practices clearly. The truth is that in the divine affairs of India there reigns much confusion; I can only say that there is a multitudinous worship of deified men, of animals and plants, of stocks and stones; and that this army of divinities is not a fixed establishment; it is constantly shifting and changing; there seems to be a regular course of the generation, evolution, and decay of the lesser divinities. Then there are numerous religious sects, holding peculiar doctrines, and there are spiritual teachers who from time to time appear and promulgate new rites and beliefs. There are also some well-known orders of wandering friars and ascetics.

I ought also to mention here that the religion is still spreading. The aboriginal tribes, the clans and races which still inhabit the hill tracts, the outlying uplands and the uncleared jungle districts of India, are melting into Hinduism as they settle down and become comparatively civilized.

Among these communities a social change is going on ; they alter their mode of life to suit altered conditions of existence, and with a change of habits comes always a change of ideas. They pass into Brahmanism by a natural upward transition which leads them to adopt the rituals of the classes immediately above them. We may reasonably guess that this transition has been going on for centuries, and that the primitive beliefs have been constantly slipping and falling like an ever-breaking seashore into the ocean of Brahmanism. And Brahmanism accepts the adhesion of the outer gentiles, it invites them to come in and conform, and to place themselves under the spiritual direction of the orthodox priesthood ; it holds open to them the gates of admission into Brahmanic caste and creed. This is the natural melting down into a formal religion of the creeds and customs of wild folk who emerge intellectually aimless and wandering out of the barbarous state.

Here then, in short, we have an immense undefined system of complicated ritual and propitiatory worship of all the powers that influence man, an apparent wilderness of polytheism, the worship of a multitude of invisible gods, overlying a lower form of religious animism, the direct adoration of visible natural objects—all these religious practices being more or less sanctioned by ancient tradition, by the sacred books and by the hereditary caste of priests, who are stewards of the mysteries and who invest the grosser forms of religion with a mysterious symbolism which always points to something beyond what is visible. Now it can be easily understood that great differences may exist in the feelings and meanings with which traditional rites may be practised among the different classes. With the more ignorant folk, the propensity to worship the marvellous runs wild into absurd superstitions. But it can also be perceived that an educated and pious Hindu may fairly argue that grateful oblations and reverent worship may reasonably be given to those beings in whom he personifies the bounty and benignity of Nature. Nor has it been usually thought wrong in religion to propitiate agencies and influences that may be terrible or benevolent—may reward or punish. There can be no harm, to a devout worshipper, in regarding deities as glorious and mysterious links in the grand circle of existences, visible or invisible, the powers which have created which can destroy or preserve.

So far as can be discerned by a foreigner looking at the ordinary crowd of worshippers, the object and motives of Hindu piety are to note what men want, and if possible to give the gods what may please them. This is the end of their prayer and sacrifice ; the gods are worshipped because experience proves that it is useful to do so. But this is by no means all. There is behind those simple and direct motives for piety the doctrine of future existences, of the transmigration of the soul through numerous stages of penal and purifying trials, through the bodies of animals, and through higher forms, until at last the soul is finally absorbed into the supreme being. If you asked a Hindu, whether priest or peasant, what is the ultimate good to be aimed at, he would answer, "Liberation," by which

he means the freedom of the soul from its bondage of union to the body, to anything that has sensation, and its return to the infinite spirit whence it issued. And this can only be accomplished by a painful passage through a labyrinth of existences. It does not seem, however, that the belief in this kind of future life or final state after death plays such a large part in the Hindu religion as it does in other great Faiths; on the contrary, with the people at large the aid and countenance of the gods in this present life—in the visible world,—their pleasure and displeasure, are the really important objects of devotion.

The inner and deeper aspects of philosophic Hinduism lie beyond the scope of this essay, though Pantheism, the doctrine that the divine energy is everywhere visibly immanent, may almost be termed an article of popular faith. It may be observed, however, that the peculiarity of Hinduism lies in this—that as a religion it is not a circumscribed scheme of life and death, but that, while it begins very low down, with a grotesque idolatry, it rises nevertheless to very lofty heights of theosophy, and disappears into the clouds as it ascends. The deities themselves are subject to the eternal law of change which governs all sentient existence; for all that we perceive is but an illusion, and the universe itself is held by one famous theologic school to be in some mysterious way only an emanation from the supreme Soul, a projection of creative power into space. So far, say the sages, as anything exists, it does so by the virtue of divine energy enforcing it. The soul, when purified from all illusion, attains true wisdom, and is absorbed in the totality of existences, that fall like drops of rain into a sea, into the great universal soul or spirit.

Thus death, like sleep, is a mere interval between periods of conscious existence, the successive births answering to the regular wakings from sleep, and the chief difference between sleep and death is that, so far as can be understood, we have no distant memory of former lives, as we have of past days, though we have the hereditary taint of former sins and lower instincts. The true goal and final purpose of passage through all these worlds and existences is to get finally beyond reach of the power which afflicts men with sensation. There may be a heaven or hell, there may be many such places, just as there are many gods; but even in heaven one is not quite secure, as the history of Milton's fallen angels warns us, and the Hindu thinks it safest to travel beyond all possible vicissitudes of joy and sorrow into a state that is likened to dreamless sleep. It must be explained also, in connection with this feeling, that the high philosopher secretly looks down on the ordinary worship of the gods, because its object is merely connected with pleasure and pain here or hereafter.

From this point of view, therefore, it is of little use for those who attack Hinduism to expound to the Hindu that his mythology is mere imagination and that his gods are fanciful creations; the higher Brahmans will reply that they are well aware that the divinities are only the outward figures, symbols or indications of the incomprehensible power behind everything.

They would say it is the early form in which the Pantheistic principle and divine omnipresent energy can be interpreted to the people, and that the ordinary worship is really paid to manifestations of the deity who is identical in substance with all forces and forms. But if the deity and the natural universe are the same, there must still be something beyond, and those who ask what it is may be told that there is somewhere an infinite being unconditioned and unconscious, which acknowledges no liability for the soul's existence, and disowns all interest in human affairs. It is the soul's concern to escape out of the endless desert of ignorance and delusion; the spirit looks on at the struggle with absolute indifference.

It will be no matter of surprise, however, to learn that there are many different schools and sects of Hindu philosophy, and various solutions of the great metaphysical problems regarding man's future destiny, or the nature of the deity, although in this epoch there is no room for more than a passing reference to them. There are certain theories, showing more or less of a tendency to pure materialism in theories in which the rise and growth of the visible world is attributed to no other cause than the blind striving of Nature, forming itself out of the primary element of plastic matter and becoming the sport of unintelligent forces.

The Sankhya philosophy represents matter acting a sort of pantomime before the soul, like a dancing girl before some prince, twisting itself into myriad shapes and postures, the world being thus merely the theatre upon which the soul, held apart, looks out and watches the performance.

From what has been said one may obtain some general measure of the vast difference in ideas and external observances which separates the higher and lower phases of religious belief in India. Between the two extremes, between simple, direct polytheism and idolatry on the one hand, and lofty speculations and symbolic rites on the other, the connection is difficult to trace and demonstrate, yet it exists. Something of the kind may be found in every religion; because while on the one hand no religion can subsist at all if it does not square with the common facts and circumstances of the world we inhabit, on the other hand every religion must have a kind of philosophic theory of the universe somewhere in the background—must have a comparatively reasonable answer to the great questions whether there is a future life for men, whether God is knowable, and to what extent human affairs are regulated by the divine providence. The peculiarity of Hinduism is that it is so elastic as to provide beliefs and rites of every kind, such as are satisfactory and suitable to the humblest idol-worshippers, and those which answer to the intellectual conceptions of the highest mind in India. But to satisfy subtle inquirers of this latter class the answer must go far. For although the Hindu will accept, provisionally, all kinds of presentations of the divine power, and he will listen to extravagant mythologies, all this does not by any means satisfy him, for there must evidently be something beyond. And if he is in a philosophic temper, he concludes that it has pleased the eternal powers to make them-

selves known to ordinary humanity by a kind of masquerade, by all kinds of shapes and figures and feelings—that the whole thing is what has been called a Cosmic Illusion, behind which lies an unknown and incomprehensible Reality. It is not impossible that our men of science in these latter days may have come to much the same conclusion, though it may be expressed in different phraseology.

But there is another question which Englishmen are likely to ask, though it has not yet come to the foreground in India. They are probably accustomed to regard religion as a scheme for the moral government of mankind, and they will desire to know what are the ethical bearings and influences of Hinduism; that is, how their beliefs are connected with right and wrong, of the punishment of sin and the reward of virtue. Well, it is to be admitted that among a great number of Hindus the religious idea has not yet reached that particular stage at which one object of divine government is assumed to be the advancement of morals. It must also be admitted that there is a considerable minority whose ideas have passed beyond this stage, and who conceive their supreme divinity as indifferent to the moral or inward nature of human acts. Or rather, it might be said, that the divinity, being all knowing, knows that good and bad things equally work out the final purpose. And it must be confessed that many of the rites and practices of Hinduism are quite contrary to ordinary notions of moral conduct, though not more so than the practices of the most civilized nations of antiquity, of Greece or Rome. But this is mainly because Brahmanism accepts and tolerates the worships and superstitions that have grown up among the rude tribes, or have been handed down from primitive times. We are to remember that there are books in Hinduism, full of moral precepts and virtuous maxims, enjoining piety, austerity, and abnegation of self. There is a great feeling for justice, self-restraint, unselfishness and bodily purity. But the loose structure of the religion, varying between outward polytheism and inner mysticism, does not favour the use of fixed positive articles of faith for the purpose of enforcing moral precepts. Christianity, for example, incessantly and distinctly enjoins righteousness; whereas Hinduism does not strenuously sanction and affirm rules of moral conduct by the strength of a religious code directed against evil-doers. There is a high philosophy; there is a deep feeling of subordination to the divine power and will, though mainly with regard to the perils and troubles of the present life; there is also a strong impression of the transitoriness of human existence and personality. There is, moreover, as has been mentioned already, a Hindu hell and heaven, and there is the doctrine of future pains and penalties, but it conveys chiefly the lesson that a soul may lose or gain by certain acts or omissions, and that it has to pass through innumerable stages of purgatory before it can be cleansed from its worldly stains. And the high ritual of the Brahmans, with its elaborate forms, its severe penances, is only self-discipline for the purpose of wrestling with or appeasing the unknown but ubiquitous influences that

press round on the soul in its passage through the diverse trials. According to this doctrine—I mean the transmigration of souls—its future fate is regulated, not according to the decision of a just and terrible judge, but by the spontaneous and, as it were, natural operation of a soul's experience, by the inevitable consequence of certain acts or accidents. Nevertheless it is clear that this belief contains some good elements of practical morality, as it makes men responsible for the consequences of their acts during any one of these existences; insomuch that a Hindu, when he falls into misfortune, will often declare that it must have come upon him as a consequence of some sin committed in a previous existence. And the doctrine thus keeps alive a sense of being answerable for one's acts, and an anxiety about the unknown future. Nevertheless the idea, in this shape, is too remote and not precise enough to be of much weight in impressing the minds of the masses, and it has nothing like the force of stern commandments supernaturally delivered, forbidding crime and enjoining duties. And, above all things, the supreme spirit of the Hindus is indifferent, passive, unconscious: he lets men work out their own end. There is no almighty power who orders, directs, and is in sympathy with mankind.

Lastly, some may ask what is likely to be the outcome and future of this ancient and extraordinary religion. It has always been changing more or less, and it will now go on changing faster than ever, under the influence of contact with Europe. Moreover, it is a historical fact that all religious forms and beliefs undergo an incessant transformation—are profoundly modified by circumstances. There has always been a reforming school in Hinduism,—a desire to throw off the coarser conceptions and practices and to adopt things more spiritual and morally better. There have also been very recently various attempts in this direction; there has been a desire to prove that the Vedas, the original sacred books, do not sanction the abuses of later Hinduism; that they may be interpreted as against the prevailing idolatry, and that the real Hinduism prescribed by holy writ is a much higher and purer revelation. The reader may have heard of the Brahmo Somaj, which is a kind of enlightened deism, a pure and exalted conception of God as the supreme moral Governor, the impersonation of the highest justice and goodness, as revealed through His works. And there is another religious society called the Arya Samáj, which receives the Vedas as the book of true knowledge, and worships God as the Fountain of all knowledge and the primeval Cause. But the defect of all these speculations lies in a certain vagueness; they have no exact revelation or authentic message to deliver for the consolation of common men; they depend for their authority too much on the mere opinions of pious and benevolent men; they pretend to no supernatural warrant or inspiration, and the people at large still need something of that kind. And, on the whole, it is not clear if an opinion be ventured on such a matter, that the disappearance of the popular superstitions will

leave any solid platform upon which a superior religion may be built up afresh. On the one hand, the Hindus are not barbarous tribes who can be lifted up by missionaries from a lower to a higher stage of belief; and, on the other hand, the attempt to found a new faith upon the old philosophies is not likely to succeed. And I must repeat that the real substance and mainspring of Indian religion is not polytheism, but Pantheism; and it is with Pantheism, a very subtle and deep-seated idea, that the propagation of any new faith will have to deal. For Pantheism, which sees God everywhere and in everything, is a sort of boundless sea of credulity which swallows up all the forms of belief. But there can be little doubt, I think, that the whole edifice of polytheism is likely to break up and melt off the surface of civilized India; that their immemorial superstitions will collapse before the steady maintenance of peace and law, the advancement of learning and the influx of knowledge. If we can prove to the Hindu that life is better worth living than formerly, he will abandon much of his pessimism, and in the new world to which the people are being introduced there will be no place for the old deities. Meanwhile they are passing through a hard trial, for Europe itself is an arena of contending speculations, and they will not gain much by exchanging their old lamps in religion for our newest ones. And the air is still highly charged with spiritual enthusiasm, so that no one can say whether some ardent faith may not suddenly blaze up in the midst of India, that will shatter all the old fabric of religion, and lead away the great Indian multitudes in an entirely new direction.

OLD INDIAN POETRY AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.¹

BY MRS. FREDERIKA MACDONALD.

SIR GEORGE BIRDWOOD, in his important work on the Industrial Arts of India, has said that no one can properly understand Indian art who has not learned from the study of old Indian poetry something about the myths, traditions, and beliefs that this art embodies and illustrates. He goes farther than this. He says that people do not understand the customs, and ways of thinking and feeling, of the modern Hindu population unless they have some familiarity with the sacred poetry, that is still the influence lending colour, variety, and animation to the lives of the great mass of the people of India.

Now I am going to ask you to apply this statement to the study of Indian religion. In my lecture on Buddhism, I said that students who are pleased to follow the modern method, and who commence their study of Indian religious thought with Buddhism, are actually beginning to read a large volume at the closing chapters. Buddhism is the highest and most perfect development of a system of ideas and beliefs that are different from the ideas and beliefs that form the groundwork of western religious systems. And, therefore, the western student cannot easily appreciate these ideas in their latest development, unless he has made himself familiar with them in the earlier and simpler stages of their growth. In other words, he does not understand the philosophy of Indian religion unless he has penetrated to, and been to some extent penetrated by, the Indian religious sentiment.

The home of the Indian religious sentiment, and the place where it may be familiarly studied, is in those two Poems, or storehouses of poetry, that may rightly be described as the sources of the imaginative life of India. I am speaking of the *Ramāyan* and the *Mahābhārat*. I need not trouble you now with the different opinions of various authors upon the actual antiquity and positive historical worth of the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat*; because we are not at present attempting to establish the relation which this sacred poetry has to the early history of India: we are endeavouring to see it as the home of the Indian religious sentiment, and the birthplace of that higher idealism that has its noblest expression in Buddhism. But I may say, in passing, that it is now as difficult to

¹ This lecture, given at South Place Institute, Finsbury, was published in the *Woman's World* for June, 1889. It is reprinted here by kind permission of Messrs. Cassell.

establish the actual date of the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat*, as to give their true authorship. No doubt the original thread of tradition that has supplied the central stories of the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* may be traced back to a very remote period, to eighteen hundred or two thousand years B.C.,—a time when the Aryan settlers in India found themselves brought into frequent conflict with the barbarous indigenous tribes, whom we find spoken of in these Poems as “*Asuras*,” or “*Rakshasas*,” *i.e.* demons; or else, with more condescension, but even less respect, as “wild men of the woods”; in other words, a race of intelligent monkeys. But this thread of early tradition has to-day become overladen and over-clustered with later traditions, superstitious fancies, and sentimental romances. And we can readily understand how this has come about, when we remember that these great Poems have been preserved to the people of India, from generation to generation, and from age to age, not by the aid of priests and sages, kept in check by the authority of sacred volumes, but mainly by the free gifts of memory and imagination of the professional poets and story-tellers, who, from the most remote times, have wandered about India, as they still wander, from town to town and village to village, reciting and relating these cherished legends and traditions that are a part of the national life. So that the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* exist to-day, not as the creation of one Poet nor of several poets, nor are they even the poetical record of one age. They are the comprehensive record of the imaginative life of India, expanding under the social, political, and religious influences of ages whose precise and literal history is lost to us.

And it is in this record of the imaginative life of India that we find the traditions, convictions, and sentiments that every Indian Philosopher and Prophet had to count with, and, to some extent, to adapt and utilize, as the medium for conveying his spiritual lessons to the multitude. But even this is not all. These Indian prophets and philosophers were not themselves independent of the influences amidst which they were reared. It was in this atmosphere, saturated with the sentiments and traditions of ancient India, that their abstruse speculations and profound meditations were carried on. In other words, they too were children of the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat*: and it is quite easy to trace this parentage, and the influence of the old Indian sentimental temper, even in the intellectual religion of Buddha, or in the mystical pantheism of the Vedānta philosophy.

But this is just what is lost sight of by the uninitiated student, who starts off in life with the study of Buddhism and the higher schools of Brahman philosophy. And here we have, I think, the explanation of the astonishing difficulties these students assure us lie in the way of a proper understanding of Indian philosophical and religious thought—difficulties that they declare can only be elucidated by “esoteric” methods; and by the assistance of “psychological telegrams” sent from the Mahatmas in Tibet to the Theosophical Society in St. John’s Wood

But it will be admitted, I think, that there is some inherent probability that a safer clue to the meaning of Indian religious thought may be found through the study of the conditions of sentiment and belief amidst which these higher phases of thought arose. And I shall presently hope to prove to you that even the serious student of the spiritual religions of India will not lose his time, and may possibly derive many advantages, if he will consent to pass a season of preparation in what Heine has called so well the "immense Flowering Forests of old Indian Poetry." What is more, I shall hope to show you that the modern idealist may find in this old story-world some strange resemblances to the sentiments and enthusiasms that he is wont to describe as the peculiar characteristics of the "Modern Spirit."

Now, these resemblances do not lie upon the surface. The first impression made upon the Western reader by old Indian poetry is the impression that he has entered upon a strange world; a world of marvels and miracles, where common sense and common experience are entirely neglected, and where nothing is more unusual than to come upon any incident that lies within the bounds of possibility. But this is only the first impression. Let the explorer penetrate deeply enough into these immense "Flowering Forests," and very soon he discovers the charm that puts him in possession of the secret of the place, and enables him to count at its true worth this fantastic play of an imagination that is never enslaved by the dreams of its own creation. The true explanation of the miraculous atmosphere that pervades old Indian poetry is to be found, not in the Indian poet's superstition or credulity, but rather in his incredulity—his inability to take very seriously the mere show of things that is made to pass before the Soul for its instruction and entertainment.

Where all the outer life is regarded as *Maya*, Illusion, a dream, and a vision, there can be no objection felt to some incidents of the dream being incredible and extraordinary. And when this discovery is once made, the modern idealist will find himself far more at home in the spiritual atmosphere of old Indian poetry than he is in the spiritual atmosphere of the Romance Country, that is so much nearer to him in point of time, but that is haunted by the mediæval religious sentiment. I think, if the truth is told, it must be admitted that the modern idealist is not at all at home in the mediæval Romance Country. The mystical aspiration after super-human beauty and supernatural delight that is the animating enthusiasm of mediæval poetry and art has its other side, in a contempt for nature and the natural life of man, that jars upon the modern sentimental temper. You have this disdain, and even disgust, for common nature expressed in the effort to attain an ideal type of beauty as little natural as possible—a type where human mind and will, as well as human body and passion, are attenuated, and as far as possible effaced, lost in celestial meekness and self-abandonment. Now, to satisfy the modern conception of beauty, will, mind, and a noble self-possessing energy need to be expressed. Then you

have this disdain and disgust expressed also in mediæval comedy, in the choice of natural human love as a favourite theme for gross jesting; and especially in the mediæval delight in the grotesque representation of the dominion of Death over the body, in the grim humour of pictures of dancing skeletons and grinning deaths' heads, in the constant legend of the worm, corruption, crawling over the fair flower of life.

In old Indian poetry you have nothing of all this, that the modern imagination feels so morbid. Nothing, indeed, is more characteristic of the Indian poet than his failure when he attempts to deal with supernatural terrors or morbid horrors. He has his demons, as we have seen; his Asuras, Rakshasas, and others; but it is amusing to observe his inability to deal with them as *bonâ-fide* demons. The demons of Indian poetry generally become praiseworthy characters at the close of their career, and die in the odour of sanctity. Ravana, for instance, the King of the Rakshasas, the Demon of the Ramāyan, dies a valorous death; and the perfect hero, Rama, pronounces a complimentary speech over his funeral pyre. Then, in Indian poetry you have a great love of the grotesque: but the Indian grotesque has nothing morbid about it; it deals with life, not with death, and means only an extreme pleasure in the quaint and humorous aspects of nature. The mysticism of old Indian poetry, too, is the mysticism of pantheism—a mysticism that does not see in nature the enemy of the soul, but that sees all visible nature as the dream of the universal Soul or Mind that is the one true existence. And the dreamer has no disgust for his dream, but only tenderness and compassion. He takes pleasure in his dream, in its admirable and beautiful features, only the pleasure is tinged with melancholy, because he feels that—even whilst he is watching it—the dream is vanishing away.

And here you have the first point of resemblance between the Indian and the modern sentimental tempers—in a certain enthusiasm of compassion, that touches with pathos, and even with sublimity, the common face of nature and of man—looking at all common things from a visionary's standpoint,—a visionary, free from supernatural terror, but never entirely free from the world's sorrow,—from the consciousness of age waiting upon youth, of fatigue following after pleasure, of love ending in loss, and life vanishing in death. And then, amidst the mingled reverence and compassion of this sentimental temper, you have the *awakenings* of the higher spiritual temper, that has its finest expression in Buddhism, and its counterpart in what the modern idealist describes as the "cosmic emotion;" the effort to set life's purposes and hopes beyond the personal state, the endeavour to "make the mind its own state," by training it to take its stand by the facts of thought and intellect; and the attempt to liberate the Soul from the painful sense of the impermanency and imperfection of material conditions, not by encouraging it to hope for a change of these external conditions, but by urging it to the conquest of spiritual disinterestedness.

Now, the only means of proving to you that these are the essential

qualities of old Indian poetry will be to send you to the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* ; and all that I can do now is to direct your attention to some stories, here and there, that may illustrate these qualities, and prove to you that they do not exist merely in my own imagination. These stories themselves you will, of course, expect to find Eastern, and of the old world. It is the sentiment these stories express that I am supposing you will find more in harmony with modern feeling than the sentiment that pervades mediæval romance.

The first story I have chosen from the *Mahābhārat* is a curious example of the exactly opposite sentiments that inspire Indian and mediæval legends. I need not remind you of the beautiful story of the perfect knight Sir Galahad, and of many other stories of sinless knights and holy maidens, who are made indifferent to earthly love by the vision of celestial beauty ? In the Indian story you have the opposite of this : you have the ideal maiden rendered indifferent to celestial beauty by the vision of human sorrow.

Once upon a time, then,—to begin my story in good old orthodox fashion,—there was a young Rajah, named Nala, who was famous throughout all India for his good looks, kind heart, and many accomplishments. In a neighbouring country to Rajah Nala's, reigned another rajah, who had a daughter of astonishing goodness and beauty. Now Rajah Nala had heard so much of the beauty of Rajah Bhima's daughter, that he fell deeply in love with her, although, of course, he had never seen her ; and so much in love was he that he gave up all his studies and favourite amusements, and spent the leisure that the affairs of State left him in wandering to and fro in a solitary and shady grove near his palace, meditating upon the beautiful young princess, and repeating her name over and over again with all manner of endearing epithets. Now the name of Rajah Bhima's daughter was Damayanti. One day, when the young Rajah was wandering thus in his favourite grove, a flock of swans flew by him, and Rajah Nala, stretching forth his hand carelessly, caught one of the beautiful birds. Then the swan said to him : "Rajah Nala, do let me go, and I will carry a message for you to the maiden whom you love."

"Who is the maiden I love, you foolish swan ?" asked the Rajah.

And the swan replied : "I had need be foolish, indeed, if I did not know that ! My home is in this wood ; and do I not hear you every day murmur over and over, in the most tiresome fashion, the name of the Princess Damayanti ?"

Then Rajah Nala was a little confused. But he was pleased, on the whole, with the swan's proposal, and he began a very long message ; but the swan stopped him in the midst of it saying : "Hush ! I should never remember all that. Better leave the message to me, and be sure I will plead your cause well with the Princess."

So Rajah Nala consented ; he opened his hand, and the swan flew away, straight off in the direction of the country ruled over by Rajah Bhima.

Next day the Princess Damayanti was playing at ball in the garden of her father's palace with the young maidens who were her companions. Presently, over the garden wall, flew a flock of beautiful swans, and began to flutter about in the garden, as though to tempt the young girls to run after them. And so they all did, with cries of delight; but nobody caught a swan except Damayanti, who flung her arms round the most beautiful bird of all the flock.

The swan pretended to be in a great fright, and cried out: "Oh, let me go, do let me go, Princess Damayanti! And I will tell you the name of the handsomest young rajah in the whole world, who is pining away for love of you."

Then the princess said: "What nonsense you talk, you foolish swan! I have never left my father's palace; how then should any young rajah be pining for love of me?"

"The fame of your beauty, Damayanti, has flown abroad like a messenger of love, and it has so moved the heart of the young Rajah Nala that he does nothing but sigh forth your name day and night."

The Princess asked: "And what sort of prince is this Rajah Nala, you foolish swan?"

And the swan answered: "No such prince has ever ruled in all India! He is beloved everywhere, amongst great and small; and amongst his own subjects he is known by the name of 'The Protector of the Poor.' In fact, so noble a man is Nala, that only the noblest and most beautiful of princesses is worthy to espouse him; and my reason for coming here to-day was to see whether the Princess Damayanti was deserving of the love he gives her."

Then Damayanti asked, anxiously: "And what do you think now, good swan? Am I worthy of the love of the noble Nala?"

"Yes," the swan answered. "You alone of all the maidens in the land of India are worthy of him."

"Well, if you think that," said Damayanti, releasing the swan, "do fly back at once to Nala and tell him so."

Now, after this conversation with the swan, a great change took place in the young Princess Damayanti. She was no longer as merry as she had once been; she wearied of her favourite games; she would not even eat the nicest sweetmeats; and her old nurse reported that she was restless in her sleep. Rajah Bhima, who was devotedly fond of his daughter, grew very anxious. But the Ranee, Damayanti's mother, said that was no cause for uneasiness, only that it was now time enough for the young princess to celebrate her *swayamvara*.

The *swayamvara* was the festival given by any Indian chief who had a daughter arrived at marriageable age. The young chieftains who felt disposed to aspire to the hand of the princess were invited to attend this festival; and there were games of skill to show off the suitors' strength and courage; and then, at the end of the festival, the princess herself was called

upon to choose a bridegroom for herself amongst her suitors. You see by this that in the old Hindu world there were none of those modern arbitrary marriage customs that make the daughter her father's chattel, to be disposed of in childhood without any question as to her own feelings and inclinations; and you will find too, by the study of the old sacred poetry of India, that the position of women was comparatively independent and dignified in these ages, and up to the period of the Mohammedan conquest of India. A great deal is said, of course, about the absolute devotion and obedience a woman owes her husband; but I don't think the Indian poets insist upon this matter any more than St. Paul does. And, in any case, we find that the women in the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* were rather true and devoted than abjectly submissive wives. There is nothing said about the seclusion of women; or about their being forbidden to go about unveiled; or about their being shut out from the business and pleasure of life, by the rule, of Mohammedan origin, that a married woman must never see any man but her husband.

But this is a digression: the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* are interesting from a hundred different points of view; but it would take up too much time, and would be turning aside from the point of view we have chosen, if I were to dwell now upon the many interesting disclosures of the prevailing social customs and ideas of ancient India, that are given even in these episodes we are now considering. Those of you, however, who are interested in the matter, might read Sir Monier Williams's valuable work on old Indian poetry.

So now let us return to the *swayamvara* of the Princess Damayanti. Rajah Bhīma sent out his heralds far and near, to proclaim the festival, and to invite all the eligible young rajahs to attend. Of course, Rajah Nala heard the news, and ordered his chariot forthwith, and started off full of hope and expectation; for the swan had safely brought him back Damayanti's message. The fame of Damayanti's beauty was so great, and also the Rajah Bhīma's wealth and power were so well known, that there was a sound of chariot wheels throughout all the land of India, so many young rajahs were there, hastening from north, south, east, and west, to the *swayamvara* of Damayanti.

Now the noise made by all these chariots, travelling in one direction, mounted up to Swarga, the heavenly mountain, where the Sky God, Indra, dwelt with the other gods—Agni, lord of fire; Varun, lord of waters; and Yama, god of death.

Indra's curiosity was excited by all this noise, so he sent the gods' messenger Naruda, the Indian Mercury, to see what could be happening on the earth. Naruda came back with the news that all this commotion was caused by the fact that the most beautiful young princess in the world was giving her *swayamvara*. When Indra heard this, he rose from his throne, and calling to Agni, Varun, and Yama, he suggested that they too should go to the *swayamvara*, and present themselves amongst Damayanti's

suitors. So, the other gods consenting, their cloud chariots were called ; and Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama started for the earth.

Now it happened that just when the gods dismounted from their cloud chariots, Rajah Nala was passing by. So Indra called to Nala, and Nala approached the gods with due reverence.

And Indra said to Nala : " Hold, Rajah Nala, we, the gods, know you for a religious man, who always pays the gods the honour due to them. Now, therefore, we have chosen you to be our messenger."

Then Nala raised his hands to his head in salutation, and asked the gods what message he was to carry, and to whom.

" You are to go at once to the Princess Damayanti," Indra said ; " and to tell her that we, the four gods—Indra, Varun, Agni, and Yama—having heard that her great beauty makes her worthy to be the bride of an immortal, are going to present ourselves at her *swayamvara* as suitors for her hand. And you must tell her that we will reveal ourselves to her by indisputable signs, so that she may not make the fatal error of choosing a mortal bridegroom."

Then Rajah Nala trembled violently ; and he fell upon his knees, and entreated Indra not to send him on this errand.

" O Indra," he said, " I, too, love Damayanti ; and even when you met me, I was hurrying to her *swayamvara*."

But Indra only laughed scornfully, and said : " Well, Rajah Nala, you are a well-looking young prince enough ; but I suppose you do not set yourself up as a rival to the immortals ? There was no presumption in your putting yourself forward as Damayanti's suitor ; but now that you know that you have Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama to compete with, do you think you have any chance of success ? Besides, all that does not matter : mortals have no business to consult their own feeling before obeying the orders of the gods ; and we order you to take our message to the lovely Princess Damayanti forthwith."

" But how can I do this, Indra ? " Nala asked. " You know that the Princess Damayanti is safely guarded in her father's palace. Do you think that Rajah Bhima's gatekeepers would admit me, a strange man, to the young maiden's presence ? "

" That need be no difficulty for you," said Indra ; " by our power we can make you invisible to Rajah Bhima's guards, and can even pass you safely through the palace walls."

And even whilst Indra spoke, Nala felt himself hurried off swiftly through the air ; and before he had time for reflection, he found himself standing in the women's quarter of Rajah Bhima's palace ; and in the very apartment where Damayanti sat at work amongst her young maidens.

You will understand how astonished these young ladies all were to see a handsome young rajah, dropped down in the midst of them, as it seemed, from the clouds. Nala himself was so bewildered by Damayanti's great beauty—that surpassed anything he had dreamt of—that he could not

upon to choose a bridegroom for herself amongst her suitors. You see by this that in the old Hindu world there were none of those modern arbitrary marriage customs that make the daughter her father's chattel, to be disposed of in childhood without any question as to her own feelings and inclinations; and you will find too, by the study of the old sacred poetry of India, that the position of women was comparatively independent and dignified in these ages, and up to the period of the Mohammedan conquest of India. A great deal is said, of course, about the absolute devotion and obedience a woman owes her husband; but I don't think the Indian poets insist upon this matter any more than St. Paul does. And, in any case, we find that the women in the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* were rather true and devoted than abjectly submissive wives. There is nothing said about the seclusion of women; or about their being forbidden to go about unveiled; or about their being shut out from the business and pleasure of life, by the rule, of Mohammedan origin, that a married woman must never see any man but her husband.

But this is a digression: the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat* are interesting from a hundred different points of view; but it would take up too much time, and would be turning aside from the point of view we have chosen, if I were to dwell now upon the many interesting disclosures of the prevailing social customs and ideas of ancient India, that are given even in these episodes we are now considering. Those of you, however, who are interested in the matter, might read Sir Monier Williams's valuable work on old Indian poetry.

So now let us return to the *swayamvara* of the Princess Damayanti. Rajah Bhima sent out his heralds far and near, to proclaim the festival, and to invite all the eligible young rajahs to attend. Of course, Rajah Nala heard the news, and ordered his chariot forthwith, and started off full of hope and expectation; for the swan had safely brought him back Damayanti's message. The fame of Damayanti's beauty was so great, and also the Rajah Bhima's wealth and power were so well known, that there was a sound of chariot wheels throughout all the land of India, so many young rajahs were there, hastening from north, south, east, and west, to the *swayamvara* of Damayanti.

Now the noise made by all these chariots, travelling in one direction, mounted up to Swarga, the heavenly mountain, where the Sky God, Indra, dwelt with the other gods—Agni, lord of fire; Varun, lord of waters; and Yama, god of death.

Indra's curiosity was excited by all this noise, so he sent the gods' messenger Naruda, the Indian Mercury, to see what could be happening on the earth. Naruda came back with the news that all this commotion was caused by the fact that the most beautiful young princess in the world was giving her *swayamvara*. When Indra heard this, he rose from his throne, and calling to Agni, Varun, and Yama, he suggested that they too should go to the *swayamvara*, and present themselves amongst Damayanti's

suitors. So, the other gods consenting, their cloud chariots were called ; and Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama started for the earth.

Now it happened that just when the gods dismounted from their cloud chariots, Rajah Nala was passing by. So Indra called to Nala, and Nala approached the gods with due reverence.

And Indra said to Nala : " Hold, Rajah Nala, we, the gods, know you for a religious man, who always pays the gods the honour due to them. Now, therefore, we have chosen you to be our messenger."

Then Nala raised his hands to his head in salutation, and asked the gods what message he was to carry, and to whom.

" You are to go at once to the Princess Damayanti," Indra said ; " and to tell her that we, the four gods—Indra, Varun, Agni, and Yama—having heard that her great beauty makes her worthy to be the bride of an immortal, are going to present ourselves at her *swayamvara* as suitors for her hand. And you must tell her that we will reveal ourselves to her by indisputable signs, so that she may not make the fatal error of choosing a mortal bridegroom."

Then Rajah Nala trembled violently ; and he fell upon his knees, and entreated Indra not to send him on this errand.

" O Indra," he said, " I, too, love Damayanti ; and even when you met me, I was hurrying to her *swayamvara*."

But Indra only laughed scornfully, and said : " Well, Rajah Nala, you are a well-looking young prince enough ; but I suppose you do not set yourself up as a rival to the immortals ? There was no presumption in your putting yourself forward as Damayanti's suitor ; but now that you know that you have Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama to compete with, do you think you have any chance of success ? Besides, all that does not matter : mortals have no business to consult their own feeling before obeying the orders of the gods ; and we order you to take our message to the lovely Princess Damayanti forthwith."

" But how can I do this, Indra ? " Nala asked. " You know that the Princess Damayanti is safely guarded in her father's palace. Do you think that Rajah Bhima's gatekeepers would admit me, a strange man, to the young maiden's presence ? "

" That need be no difficulty for you," said Indra ; " by our power we can make you invisible to Rajah Bhima's guards, and can even pass you safely through the palace walls."

And even whilst Indra spoke, Nala felt himself hurried off swiftly through the air ; and before he had time for reflection, he found himself standing in the women's quarter of Rajah Bhima's palace ; and in the very apartment where Damayanti sat at work amongst her young maidens.

You will understand how astonished these young ladies all were to see a handsome young rajah, dropped down in the midst of them, as it seemed, from the clouds. Nala himself was so bewildered by Damayanti's great beauty—that surpassed anything he had dreamt of—that he could not

speak to her. Damayanti, however, soon recovered her presence of mind. She felt convinced that this must be the Rajah Nala; for had not the swan told her that Nala was the handsomest prince in the world? and who could be handsomer than this young stranger? So she raised her hands to her forehead in polite salutation, and, approaching Nala, asked him, in a gentle voice, by what means he had come there, and what it was that he wished to say.

Then Nala dared not look at the beautiful Damayanti, lest he should be betrayed into falseness to the gods; but he answered: "I have come here, invisible to your father's guards, noble Damayanti; I have been given power to pass through these thick palace walls, by the commands of the four gods—Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama. The fame of your beauty has mounted up to Swarga; so that the gods are resolved to come to your *swayamvara*. They have sent me to warn you that they will make themselves known to you by showing signs of their immortality, and these signs will prevent you from confounding them with your merely mortal suitors."

Then Damayanti smiled, and said: "I have always paid due reverence and worship to the gods; but ever since my conversation with the swan I have determined to give my love to none but Rajah Nala."

But Nala shook his head, sadly: "That was very well, noble Damayanti," he said, "before you had the gods amongst your wooers. But when your eyes fall on the eternally radiant and happy gods, how should you keep in your recollection a wretched man like me?"

Damayanti, however, assured Nala that she would choose no one else; and presently the young Rajah felt himself pulled, as it were, by strong cords; and Damayanti, and the apartment in Rajah Bhima's palace, vanished; and Nala found himself standing by the roadside, where Indra, Agni, Varun, and Yama, were waiting for him. Rajah Nala told the four gods precisely what Damayanti had said—that she would give the gods due worship, but that her love and her hand she would only give to Nala.

But Indra only smiled, and said: "Well, we shall see how that will be when the time comes. But, meanwhile, you have earned the favour of the gods by your faithfulness as their messenger."

The day of the *swayamvara* came at last; and there was a great camp round Rajah Bhima's palace, made by the retinue of all the rich and mighty rajahs who had come, with elephants and horses laden with gifts and treasures, and any number of retainers and servants, so as to make a display of their magnificence. All the rajahs were assembled in the great audience hall, that was made dazzling by the silken turbans and jewelled raiment of these magnificent suitors. But Damayanti had only eyes for one amongst all this crowd, and she sought eagerly amongst her suitors for Rajah Nala. Then, to her surprise and dismay, she made a strange discovery; behold, there were five men in the throng of suitors exactly alike, and all five wore the countenance and outward appearance of Rajah Nala!

Then Damayanti understood that Indra, Varun, Agni, and Yama had taken this form, because she had said that she would choose no other suitor but Nala. So she raised her hands to her forehead, and bowing herself reverently, she said: "I have always paid due worship to the gods. May the immortals now be true to their promise, and show me the signs by which I may know them as greater and more gifted than common men."

And as Damayanti spoke, a greater radiance fell upon four of the five men; whilst, by contrast, the fifth seemed to stand in a dark shadow. Damayanti knew the gods, because their eyes, that had never shed tears, looked straight, and did not blink; because their raiment shone without one speck of dust, showing they did not toil; because their feet, where they stood, did not touch the earth, showing they were not doomed to ever mingle with the dust, or to undergo the doom of death. But Nala, the man Nala, had a certain dimness of the eyes, because he had wept, and had yet to weep; on his raiment was the dust that told he was condemned to human toil; and his feet touched the earth, because, earth-born, he was doomed to die. And Damayanti, looking upon Nala, loved him all the more because of these signs of the common human destiny and fate he shared with her; and so, stepping down from her throne, and passing by the great immortals, she raised the hem of Nala's garment and kissed it, in token that she chose him for her lord. So Nala and Damayanti were married. . . .

And now I am afraid I must forego the pleasure of telling you their future story, although it is one of the most delightful of stories; but then it has no direct bearing on the subject of my lecture. You will find the story told by Mr. Talboys Wheeler in the second volume of his *Early History of India*: and you may read the literal translation from the *Mahābhārat* in the admirable French version of M. Hippolyte Fauche.¹

This story of Damayanti's choice is only one amongst many that might be chosen from the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat*, in illustration of the enthusiasm of compassion that belongs to the sentimental temper of old Indian poetry. There is the admirable story of how Valmiki, the supposed narrator of the *Ramāyan* received the gift of poetry.² Valmiki is a holy hermit, leading a life of meditation in the forest. The constant subject of his meditation is the sorrow of the world. One day the God Brahma tells him the story of Rama. Valmiki feels that if only a Poet could be found to sing this story of a perfect life, in noble verse, then men would be urged to kinder, purer, nobler lives. But he, Valmiki, is no Poet. What is to be done to find one worthy of so noble a task? Valmiki ponders the matter over many days. Then, one morning, it chances that he stands on the border

¹ *Vana-Parva*, 3 vols., Fauche's *Mahā-bhārat*. (The episode of Nala and Damayanti is related by the Sage Vrihadasva to Yuddisthira.)

² See my *Iliad of the East*, opening chapter; also *French Translation of Ramāyana*, by M. Hippolyte Fauche.

of a clear pool near his hermitage, where he is wont to perform those ablutions that form part of a Brahman's religious duties: and opposite him, across the pool, he observes two herons, of lovely plumage, flapping their wings and flying to and fro, full of innocent delight in life. But suddenly one of the birds falls, struck by a hunter's arrow; and the pure waters of the pool are stained by a track of blood! Then Valmiki is so moved to compassion and anger, that a cry breaks from his heart—a cry of lamentation for the innocent bird's death, and for the hunter's cruelty. And his words take a rhythmical measure that is full of passionate music; and having once repeated them, he feels compelled again and again to say the words over and over. Then Valmiki, marvelling much at what has befallen him, returns to his hermitage. And on the road he meets Brahma, who asks him if he has found a poet worthy to tell the story of the perfect man Rama? Valmiki means to answer that he has not; but instead of speaking the words he would, the lamentation for the heron's death rushes to his lips, and he is confused and abashed before Brahma, fearing the God may think he means to mock him. But Brahma smiles, and says,—

“Happy Valmiki! You have received the grace of Sarasvati, goddess of poetry, in recompense for your pity for the heron. Go now, and sing to the listening worlds the story of the perfect man Rama.”

In Valmiki you have the type of the holy and benevolent hermit of Indian story. But there is a hermit of quite another type and character, who is very frequently met with in the Ramāyan and Mahābhārat, and who may even be encountered in the actual India of to-day. Now, if we wish to avoid some fatal errors in judging Indian poetry, and the Indian religious sentiment, we must get at clearer ideas concerning the different spiritual rank of these two types of hermits. It is from the Ramāyan and Mahābhārat we shall learn how to distinguish between the different sort of respect paid to the holy recluse who abandons the world to lead the religious life, and the more common ascetic, who inflicts all manner of strange penances upon himself, in order to obtain some material advantages or to acquire magical powers. You find in old Indian poetry, just as you find in the superstitious fancy of India to-day, a very strong conviction that magical powers are acquired by self-macerations and penitential exercise. *But these magical powers are not regarded as spiritual gifts at all*: they are looked upon as material advantages, purchased by material means. If you have read the beautiful Buddhist *Suttas* contained in the tenth volume of *The Sacred Books of the East*, you will remember that, in the *Tevigga Sutta*, Buddha describes the miracle-workers of his day as worldly-minded men, who give themselves up to low arts and lying practices, from which the true Bikshu (or religious man) will abstain. And in old Indian poetry also you find these wonder-working ascetics described as personages whom it is dangerous to offend, but not at all as men who are admirable for their virtuous lives or good behaviour. On the contrary, all the most famous ascetics of the Ramāyan and Mahābhārat, and

those whose miraculous powers are most remarkable, are represented as ill-natured, vindictive, and licentious. One of these worthies, Vibishana by name, withdraws himself from all the joys of life, and inflicts inhuman torments upon himself for I don't remember how many years, with the sole purpose of obtaining power to wither at a glance any being, man or animal, who may chance to disturb his meditations! And Ravana, the demon of the *Ramāyan*, has obtained all his magical power for mischief through years of devotion to penitential exercises.

These penitential exercises, then, do not suppose a spiritual temper in those who practise them, but rather the reverse. You will recollect that almost the first step Gotama takes on his path to the Buddhahood is the discovery that the fastings and self-macerations recommended by the Brahmins are useless as means for obtaining spiritual enlightenment. And in his first sermon—the *Sutta* entitled “The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness”—Buddha declares that self-torture is as harmful as self-indulgence to the spiritual mind. The object of the true ascetic, Buddha says, is not to afflict his body, but to subdue his body to his spirit, so that the best energy may be thrown into the higher life. You need not expect to find this stated with the same clear eloquence and power in the *Ramāyan* and *Mahābhārat*; but, at the same time, you do find, amidst the crowd of malignant ascetics, whose appearance in any story is always a sign of coming mischief, a hermit, here and there, of calm and beautiful temper, who declares these penitential practices, and the magical powers obtained through them, to be unworthy of those who have truly entered upon the religious life.

I shall hope to make this very important matter plain to you, by the stories of two eminent penitents—“Bulls amongst Penitents,” the Indian poet calls them—who tread in the fantastic world of old story something of the same path that is made noble and earnest afterwards by the holy footprints of Buddha.

The first of these “Bulls amongst Penitents” is by no means a holy man to start with. I am speaking of the mighty Rajah Visvamitra. Those amongst you who are readers of German poetry may have heard his name before, for Heine has a satirical verse at his expense. Here is an English reading of it—

“The mighty monarch Visvamitra
Plagues himself, by solemn vow;
He would gain the Priest Vasistha's
Most esteemed and sacred Cow.
O, most mighty Visvamitra!
What strange animal art thou?
What, these pains, these macerations,
Only to obtain a Cow?

Heine, however, is a little unjust to Rajah Visvamitra: the cow for whose sake he macerates himself is no ordinary animal; she is truly, as the Indian poet declares, a “pearl amongst ruminant creatures”; inasmuch as whosoever milks her obtains the object of his desires. So that,

after all, Visvamitra's object was much the same as the objects of the prayers and religious observances of the worldly-minded man, in all ages, and of all religions.

Rajah Visvamitra, before the desire for this inestimable cow troubles his peace of mind, is described as a wealthy and powerful monarch, who has become weary of peaceful prosperity, and who starts off with a large army in search of adventures. He finds very few. Every one is so afraid of him that he cannot possibly contrive to stir up any quarrel. The Rajah's method is to ask all whom he meets if they know of any chief, or living man, so powerful as Visvamitra. And the answer he generally receives is, that no such powerful being exists, either on earth or in Swarga. One day, however, the Rajah and his army fall in with a religious mendicant, and Visvamitra, who is a pious rajah, bestows handsome gifts upon the beggar, after which he asks the mendicant the usual question, "Does he know any one so magnificent and powerful as Visvamitra?" The religious mendicant answers: "Truly, Visvamitra, you are a magnificent and powerful prince! But I know one man to whom your magnificence is as that of smoke to the solid rock, and that man is the Priest Vasistha."

"And who, pray, is this Vasistha, whose power is greater than mine?" asked the astonished Visvamitra

"He is a solitary hermit," said the religious mendicant, "who dwells in the depths of this forest. His garment is of bark, and he lives on roots and berries: yet is his power greater than that of all the rajahs in the world."

Visvamitra's curiosity is excited, and he resolves to pay this remarkable hermit a visit. So he and his army plunge into the forest; and at last they discover the solitary cavern where Vasistha dwells. Vasistha receives the Rajah very well, and they discourse upon spiritual topics, and Rajah Visvamitra is about to depart on his road highly pleased and edified. But unluckily for every one concerned, Vasistha has the thought of inviting the Rajah and his army to a feast.

Visvamitra at first politely refuses Vasistha's offer. He, the Rajah, cannot imagine how this hermit, who himself feeds upon roots and berries, can provide a feast for an army of men in the midst of the jungle. Vasistha, however, assures the Rajah there is no difficulty in the matter. And in an astonishingly short space of time, behold, a royal feast is spread on the grass—a vegetarian feast, you understand, but one consisting of all manner of highly prized delicacies, such as fried grain, sweetmeats, pastry, refreshed by rivers of curdled milk. The soldiers are highly delighted, and fall to feasting with shouts of joy. But Rajah Visvamitra's appetite is spoilt by envy; he cannot conceive how the Priest Vasistha has provided this feast all in a moment, and he begins to think there may be something in the beggar's statement that this hermit has powers greater than his own. Vasistha at length consents to explain the matter. He tells Visvamitra that Mahadeva, has given him, as a reward for his self-macerations, a wonder-working cow

named Sabala, and that he has only to milk this marvellous creature to obtain from her whatever he desires.

Then Visvamitra's anger increases. "It is not right," he says, "that a holy recluse leading a life of penitence should possess a creature who must sorely tempt him to break his vows of fasting and self-mortification. Therefore, Vasistha, it will be for your soul's health to give this miraculous Sabala to me."

"Not at all!" answers Vasistha. "Sabala supplies me with the clarified butter I have to pour on the sacrificial fire; and how otherwise should I obtain it in these wilds?"

"I will see to the matter of the sacrificial butter," answers Rajah Visvamitra. "It is a clear waste of the immaculate Sabala's magical gifts to expend them on such a trifle. What is more—as I am ruler over this country, I am the rightful owner of the cattle contained in it."

Vasistha, however, refuses all bribes, entreaties, and threats. And when Visvamitra at length orders his soldiers to seize Sabala, Vasistha hurries off and milks the miraculous cow, and obtains thereby an army twice as large as Visvamitra's.

In the end the Rajah returns to his palace and city very crestfallen and sorrowful.

He calls to him at once all the wise men and Brahmans, and consults with them how he can humble Vasistha's arrogance, and obtain possession of the miraculous cow.

The Brahmans make answer:

"Earthly weapons are of no use against Vasistha, Rajah Visvamitra. If you wish to conquer him you must fight him with his own weapons. His strength lies in the merits he has acquired by his piety and his many penances. Can you accumulate merits by the same methods? If not, renounce all hope of Sabala."

Rajah Visvamitra feels that life has no joy for him whilst Vasistha possesses Sabala. So he puts off his royal robes, abandons his palace and city, and goes forth into the jungle—there to lead the life of self-mortification and hardship that alone can give him powers like Vasistha's. I have not time to tell you of all the ingenious tortures inflicted upon himself by Rajah Visvamitra: nor of his courage and persistency when, time after time, the merits he has accumulated by virtue of his penances are all scattered to the winds in punishment for some momentary forgetfulness of his vows. It is a proof of the malevolent use to which these ascetics were supposed to turn the powers they obtained through their penitential exercises, that the gods, out of pity for mankind, invariably try to thwart them in their attempts, or at any rate to buy them off by small rewards from laying up too dangerous a store of merits. Visvamitra is thus bribed and tempted by the gods; but although they delude and lead him astray, he always returns to his purpose with renewed courage. And in the end he triumphs! He has laid up such a store of merits that no favour he can

crave will be denied him. And Indra himself comes humbly to know what is his great request; and, of course, we are prepared to hear him ask for the humiliation of Vasistha and for possession of the miraculous cow. But Visvamitra has lost all anger against Vasistha, all desire for Sabala—he does not even remember their existence! All he asks for is spiritual emancipation and a mind set free from earthly desires.

In Rajah Visvamitra's story you have an example of the freedom, and even, one may say, of the scepticism of the Indian poet, where the mere formalities of religion are concerned. Visvamitra, in his unregenerate days, violates all the *convenances* of Brahmanism; he chooses to celebrate sacrifices; he curses away at Brahmins who offend him, just as though they were ordinary *tchandalas*; he insists upon raising his friend Trisanku, body and all, to Swarga; and when Indra objects, he talks of creating new gods if the established ones show themselves so disobliging. But this scepticism affects only the outer forms, and leaves the reverence for spiritual ideas untouched.

In the story of Rajah Yayati¹ you have, however, a more serious and impressive tone; and it is in this story especially that the student must feel he is standing in the land where presently will arise the noble idealism of Buddha. Rajah Yayati has the misfortune to take to wife the daughter of a powerful Brahman possessed of extraordinary magical powers. The Rajah quarrels with his wife, and is cursed by his Brahman father-in-law with premature old age. Transformed in the full heyday of his youth into a decrepit, tottering old man, Rajah Yayati entreats for some few years of vigour, in which to bid farewell to the joys of life, that he had taken so leisurely when he had not realized that he was so soon to lose them. The Brahman consents that Rajah Yayati may exchange his old age against any happier man's youth, for a brief period of years, but at the end of the term he must again take up his punishment. After many weary years of wandering, Rajah Yayati at length persuades the youngest of his own sons to take upon his shoulders the punishment of premature old age, and to make over to his father his own youth. Then Rajah Yayati, in the short period allowed him, resolves that he will know and taste to the full all earthly joys. He first tries the pleasures of the senses, and of luxurious living; then he gives himself the excitement and adventurous life of a hunter; afterwards he tastes all the intellectual delights of philosophy and poetry. But the result in every case is the same. He proves that these joys in themselves have no existence, but that they exist only as objects of desire. He returns then to his son, and restores to him his youthful vigour and power of enjoyment, whilst he himself takes up again his punishment of old age. And this is what he says:—

“Behold, I have found that the desired object never satisfies or quiets desire; it only feeds the flame, like the clarified butter poured on sacrificial fire.

¹ *Mahābhārata Adhi Parva*, vol. I., Fauche's *Mahā-bhārata*.

"Since all the rice, all the barley, all the cattle, all the costly treasures, and all the loveliest women the earth contains, cannot satisfy one man's desire, therefore all that can be done is to kill desire itself, and cast it out.

"I will then, for my part, put off this consuming thirst of desire. Son, take again your youth; for me, turning my heart towards the contemplation of the things of eternity, I will have *my* habitation in the forest, the home of the gazelles."

Rajah Yayati then becomes a hermit. But, even so, his spiritual training is not complete. He practises severe penances, and by virtue of them obtains the privilege of mounting up to Swarga still clothed in his bodily garment. One day, however, Rajah Yayati boasts to Indra, the sky god, of his astounding penances; but these boastings rob Rajah Yayati of the merits he has obtained; and as he has only reached Swarga because of these merits, the moment they are lost he commences to fall. He enters an intermediate state—between the earthly and celestial ones—and here he is made perfect. For he learns, that "not *where* one is, but *what* one is, is the important fact." "Whether here, or in Swarga, or on the earth, or even in the abyss Naraka, the seat of my being is in myself," says Rajah Yayati. "Pain does not belong to me, but grief for pain I can avoid. Better than Swarga is it to possess one's soul in tranquillity!" And as he speaks thus, there are cries of triumph heard around him. He has reached perfection, and Swarga is his home. Rajah Yayati, however, has no impatient desire left for the celestial abode. He ascends slowly, and as it seems almost reluctantly, repeating as he goes: "Better than Swarga is it to possess one's soul in tranquillity!"

In this legend you have, as I have said, a distinct forecast of Buddhism. What is more, I cannot but think that people who read the story of Rajah Yayati with some intelligent attention must have obtained a very clear conception of Buddha's doctrine of Nirvana. At any rate, they will hardly fall into the vulgar error of supposing that Buddha promises annihilation, even as Christianity promises Eternal Life, as a recompense for the perfect life. Buddha makes no promises; he simply declares that spiritual disinterestedness is the result and crown of spiritual culture.

And now let me, in conclusion, draw your attention to the close parallel that may be found between Rajah Yayati's triumph and the triumph of the comparatively modern Teufelsdröck, as this triumph is narrated in that finest chapter of *Sartor Resartus*, the "Everlasting No." There is this difference, however: Teufelsdröck's triumph is over the fear of death and hell; Rajah Yayati's over the craving for celestial beatitude. It is of Tophet, and the pains of Tophet, that the modern idealist says, taking his stand by himself: "Hast thou not a heart? Canst thou not bear it, be it what it will?" It is of Swarga and of eternal bliss that the Indian mystic can declare: "Am I not a spirit? Shall I be greatly bettered or elated by it, be it what it may?"

BUDDHISM.

By T. W. RHYS-DAVIDS.

It is an essential doctrine, which, among all the various sects of Buddhists, has been from the beginning, and still is, constantly insisted upon, that there is nothing either divine or human, either animal, vegetable, or material, which is permanent. There is no Being, there is only Becoming. This is true of the mightiest of gods, as much as of the tiniest material atom. The state of an individual, of a thing, of a person distinct from its surroundings is unstable, temporary, sure to pass away. It may last, as in the case of the mountains, for hundreds of thousands of years; or, as in the case of some insects, for some hours only; or, as in the case of some chemical compounds, for a few seconds only; but in every case, as soon as there is a beginning, there begins also at that moment to be an ending.

In the lowest class of things we find in each individual, Form, and various material qualities. In the higher ranks of beings, such as animals, men, etc., we find also mental qualities. It is the union of these qualities which make the individual. Every person, or thing, or god, is therefore a putting together, a compound, a component individuality, what the Buddhists call a *Confection*. And in each individual, without any exception, the relation of its component parts to one another is ever changing, so that it is never the same for two consecutive moments. It follows that no sooner has separateness, individuality, begun than dissolution, disintegration, also begins. There can be no individuality without a putting together; there can be no putting together, no *Confection*, without a Becoming; there can be no becoming without a becoming different; and there can be no becoming different without a dissolution, a passing away, which sooner or later will be inevitably complete.

Now, such thoughts as these are really quite familiar to us here in the West. We acknowledge them as true of all inorganic substances, and also of all living organisms, including our own. Geology has taught us how the mightiest mountain chains, the eternal hills, and the deepest ocean depths, grow into being gradually and pass gradually away as surely and, compared with eternity, as quickly as the gorgeous butterfly. Astronomy has taught us how the broad earth itself had once no individuality; and how, as soon as it began to be, it entered also on a process of becoming, of disintegration, of continual change, which will never end till it has ceased to be. The people in Europe have inherited a belief in spirits or souls inside their bodies, and

in other spirits, good and evil, outside themselves; and to these spirits they attribute an individuality without change, a Being without Becoming, a beginning without an end. Now the Buddhists, like them, inherit from the animism (the spirit theories) of the savage the belief in the existence of these external spirits. But this belief has not constituted in their minds any exception to the great law of impermanence which underlies all Buddhist beliefs. And with regard to the internal soul, or spirit, the Buddhists do not share the view which is common among Christians; they do not acknowledge any eternal and permanent essence inside the human frame; they do not admit of those mental qualities and emotions which are symbolized by the expression "soul" that any of them are free from the great law of impermanence.

Buddhism goes even further, and says that all those great and noble qualities, emotions, sentiments, and desires which make up the noblest life of man are really discouraged and hindered by this belief in the permanence and eternity of a semi-material soul. No training in ethics will be any real advantage to the man who still nourishes this worst of all superstitions.

Secondly, it is a belief common to all schools of the Buddhists that the origin of sorrow is precisely identical with the origin of individuality. Sorrow is in fact the result of the effort which an individual has to make to keep himself separate from the rest of existence. To the universal law of composition and dissolution men and gods form no exception. The unity of forces which constitutes essential Being must sooner or later be dissolved; and it is to the effort to delay that dissolution that all sorrow and all pain are due. Wherever an individual has become separate from the rest of existence, then immediately disease, decay, and death begin to act upon it. Wherever there is individuality there must be limitation; wherever there is limitation there must be ignorance; wherever there is ignorance there must be error; wherever there is error there must sorrow come. As soon as an individual begins to be, the outside world plays upon that individual through the open doors of its six senses, sensations are stirred up within it, giving rise to ideas of attachment or of repugnance, and hence to a desire to satisfy the feelings so excited; but sometimes, more often indeed than not, it is impossible for the being thus affected to satisfy those cravings; it cannot gain what it wants, it cannot avoid what it dislikes, it cannot escape from change, disintegration, and at last from death. All these result inseparably from the struggle necessary to maintain and to carry on its separateness, its individuality. This is indeed, as I have elsewhere pointed out, a larger generalization than that which says, "A man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." It is an attempt to give a scientific explanation of the great fact of the existence of evil, and certainly the most consistent, if not the most successful, of all the efforts that have been made in that direction.

These are the principal teachings of Buddhism with regard to individuality. It will be seen that individuality is not denied. The quarrel of the Buddhist teachers is against those delusions with respect to individuality by which all persons still in the animistic stage of thought are necessarily deceived. People naturally think that they are quite separate both from the world on which they tread and from the people and other beings who inhabit it. They naturally think that they are separate both from all things and beings who have existed in the past, and all things and beings who will have their existence in the future. They even think that their own self is so important that it cannot possibly ever cease to be, and they are constantly concerning themselves with the ways and means of making that little self of their own happy and comfortable for ever. The Buddhist theory is, that these ideas are for the most part delusions; that men are blinded by delusion as to their separateness from the external world, that they are blinded by delusion as to their separateness from other beings in the past and in the future. Men overlook the fact that they are really no more separate than a bubble in the foam of an ocean wave is separate from the sea, or than a cell in a living organism is separate from the organism of which it forms a part. It is ignorance that thus leads them to think, "This is I," or "This is mine," just as a bubble or a cell might think itself an independent being.

A watchman in a lofty tower sees a charioteer driving his horse along the plain. The driver thinks he is moving rapidly, and the horse in the pride of life seems to scorn the earth from which it thinks itself so separate; but to the watchman above, horse and chariot and driver seem to crawl along the ground, and to be as much a part of the earth as the horse's mane, waving in the wind, is a part of the horse itself. As a child grows up, its mind reflects as in a mirror the image of the surrounding world, and practically though unconsciously it regards itself as the centre round which the whole universe turns. Gradually its circle widens somewhat; but the grown man never escapes from the delusion of self, and spends his life in a constant round of desires and cares, longing for objects which, when attained, produce not happiness, but fresh desires and cares. For the majority of men these cares are mean, petty, and contemptible; but even those whose ambition urges them to higher aims are equally seeking after vanity, and only laying themselves open to greater sorrows and more bitter disappointments.

So also is it with regard to the past and to the future. Men, dazed by the soul theory, and wrapped up in the present, are full of delusions about that; but they fail also to see that they are the mere temporary and passing result of causes that have been at work during immeasurable ages in the past and that will continue to act for ages yet to come. It has been the great service which Comtism has rendered to humanity, that it has taught people to try and realize the solidarity of the human race. The Buddhist doctrine of Karma is an attempt made 500 years before the

birth of Christ to formulate a similar but a wider idea. Men are merely the present and temporary links in a long chain of cause and effect, a chain in which no link is independent of the rest, can get away from the rest, or can really, as men think they can, get away, start off, and be by itself without the rest. Each link is the result of all that have gone before, and is part and parcel of all that will follow. And just as truly as no man can ever escape from his present surroundings, so can he never really dissociate himself, though he always takes it for granted that he can, either from the past which has produced him, or from the future he is helping to make. There is a real identity between a man in his present life and in the future. But the identity is not in a conscious soul which shall fly out away from his body after he is dead. The real identity is that of cause and effect. A man thinks he began to be a few years,—twenty, forty, sixty,—ago. There is some truth in that; but in a much larger, deeper, truer sense he has been (in the causes of which he is the result) for countless ages in the past; and those same causes (of which he is the temporary effect) will continue in other like temporary forms through countless ages yet to come. In that sense alone, according to Buddhism, each of us has after death a continuing life.

It is worse than no use, it is full of hindrance for a man to—

“Inflate himself with sweet delusive hope”

in the impossible. And not only is there no such thing as an individuality which is permanent;—even were a permanent individuality to be possible, it would not be desirable, for it is not desirable to be separate. The effort to keep oneself separate may succeed indeed for a time; but so long as it is successful it involves limitation, and therefore ignorance, and therefore pain. “No! it is not separateness you should hope and long for,” says the Buddhist, “it is union—the sense of oneness with all that now is, that has ever been, that can ever be—the sense that shall enlarge the horizon of your being to the limits of the universe, to the boundaries of time and space, that shall lift you up into a new plane far beyond, outside all mean and miserable care for self. Why stand shrinking there? Give up the fools’ paradise of ‘This is I,’ and ‘This is mine.’ It is a real fact—the greatest of realities—that you are asked to grasp. Leap forward without fear! You shall find yourself in the ambrosial waters of Nirvāṇa, and sport with the Arahats who have conquered birth and death!”

This theory of Karma is the doctrine which takes the place in the Buddhist teaching of the very ancient theory of “souls,” which the Christians have inherited from the savage beliefs of the earliest periods of history. It is, at the same time, the Buddhist explanation, Mystery of Fate, of the weight of the universe pressing against each individual, which the Christians would explain by the doctrine of predestination. As I have said elsewhere, the fact underlying all these theories is acknowledged to be a very

real one. The history of an individual does not begin with his birth, but has been endless ages in the making; and he cannot sever himself from his surroundings, no not for an hour. The tiniest snowdrop droops its fairy head just so much and no more, because it is balanced by the universe. It is a snowdrop, not an oak, and just that kind of snowdrop, because it is the outcome of the Karma of an endless series of past existences, and because it did not begin to be when the flower opened, or when the mother plant first peeped above the ground, or first met the embraces of the sun, or when the bulb began to shoot above the soil, or at any time which you and I can fix. A great American writer says: "It was a poetic attempt to lift this mountain of Fate, to reconcile this despotism of fate with liberty, which led the Hindoos to say, Fate is nothing but the deeds committed in a prior state of existence. I find the coincidence of the extremes of Eastern and Western speculation in the daring statement of the German philosopher, Schelling. 'There is in every man a certain feeling that he has been what he is from all eternity.' We may put a new and deeper meaning into the words of the poet:—

"Our deeds follow us from afar;
And what we have been makes us what we are."

It follows from the above that the good Buddhist cannot seek for any salvation which he is himself to enjoy in any future world. The result of his good actions, the fruit of his Karma, as the Buddhists would call it, will survive when he is dead, and advance the happiness of some other being or of some other beings who will have no conscious identity with himself. But, so far as he can reach salvation, he must reach it in this present world, he must enjoy it in this present life. The Buddhist books are constantly insisting upon the foolishness of wasting time when there is so much to do, both for one's self and for others, in any hankering after a supposed happiness of heaven. And salvation here is precisely the being delivered from delusions with regard to individuality, by which the ordinary unconverted man is still deluded. When the mind has become clear from these delusions, a new and wider brighter world reveals itself to the mind of him who has "entered upon the Path." And the Buddhist books are full of descriptions of the means which must be adopted first to get rid of the delusions, and secondly to gain the full heights of the peaceful city of Nirvana, in which he who is free from these delusions lives and moves and has his being. You have all heard of the eight stages of the Noble Path by which the Buddhist walks towards his goal, but I will venture to repeat them here by way of reminder. They will, I hope you will agree with me, bear repetition. They are:—

- (1) Right views, free from superstition or delusion.
- (2) Right aims, high, and worthy of intelligent and earnest men.
- (3) Right speech, kindly, open, truthful.
- (4) Right conduct, peaceful, honest, pure.

- (5) Right livelihood, bringing hurt or danger to no living thing.
- (6) Right effort in self-training and self-control.
- (7) Right mindfulness, the active watchful mind.
- (8) Right rapture, earnest thought on the deep mysteries of life.

You are perhaps less familiar with the thirty-seven divisions of that state of mind which follows on conversion, the thirty-seven divisions of what the Buddhists call Arahatsip, literally the state of being worthy, which is their own favourite name for the condition of those who have reached salvation. I have not time to go at length into the different explanations of these thirty-seven terms, though it is precisely in discussions about them that the Buddhist scriptures are chiefly concerned. Beginning with the lower morality, with simple things which any one can understand, the discussions rise up into the highest of thoughts, higher morality ; and it is a frequent expression, "Thus so-and-so finished his discourse, guiding it up to the topmost peak of Arahatsip." The various sects which have arisen among the Buddhists are separated from one another mostly by slight differences in the interpretation or application of one or other of these thirty-seven points. The thirty-seven are as follows :—

Firstly, the four earnest meditations, which are :—

- (a) Meditation of the body.
- (b) Meditation of the senses.
- (c) Meditation of the ideas.
- (d) Meditation on reason.

Secondly, the fourfold great struggle, which is divided into—

- (a) The struggle to prevent error arising.
- (b) The struggle to put away erroneous ideas which have arisen.
- (c) The struggle to produce goodness which had not previously existed.
- (d) The struggle to increase goodness when it does exist.

The next division is the fourfold path to Iddhi, which is divided into—

- (a) The will to acquire Iddhi united to earnest meditation and the struggle against evil dispositions.
- (b) The necessary exertion to acquire it united to earnest meditation and the struggle against evil dispositions.
- (c) The necessary preparation of the heart, united to earnest meditation and the struggle against evil dispositions.
- (d) Investigation, united to earnest meditation and the struggle against evil dispositions.

I would say, in passing on, in this division of the Arahats' life we have the germs and the real explanation of that kind of inquiry which is now-a-days known as a part of Theosophy. I mean the inquiry into peculiar states of nervous feeling and psychical experience. The way in which the old Buddhist who had got beyond delusions tried to ascertain the real meaning of these obscure phenomena was very different from that which is now followed, and we do not find that it ever occupied in their

minds the paramount position which it frequently does in modern times here in the West. Such inquiries formed only one of the many divisions of the higher life, and to pursue them alone without pursuing the others would have been considered as of no avail.

The fourth division and the fifth are each divided into five classes. These are :—

- (1) The exercise and the enjoyment of faith.
- (2) The exercise and the enjoyment of energy.
- (3) The exercise and the enjoyment of thought.
- (4) The exercise and the enjoyment of contemplation.
- (5) The exercise and the enjoyment of wisdom.

The sixth division are the seven kinds of wisdom which the Arahats had to master, and these are—

Zeal.
Intelligence.
Meditation.
Investigation.
Joy.
Repose.
Serenity.

And then, lastly, it is very instructive to notice that the Arahats who have reached, and are living in, Nirvana or Arahatship, are still to carry out the Noble, Eightfold Path, of which I have given you already the various details. It is impossible for any one to remain upon the heights who neglects the steps by which he has risen. The books are full of ecstatic descriptions of the peace and serenity, the glory and the greatness of the life of intellectual and moral perfection which the Arahats lead. These descriptions are naturally full of technical terms of Buddhist ethics, but there are occasionally found some passages which would be intelligible to a Western audience. With your permission, I will read you one :—

“Just, O King, as a lotus flower of glorious, pure, and high descent and origin is glossy, soft, desirable, sweet-smelling, longed-for, loved, and praised, untarnished by the water or the mud, crossed with tiny petals and filaments and pericarps, the resort of many bees, a child of the clear cold stream, just so is that disciple of the Noble Ones, . . . endowed with the thirty graces. And what are the thirty ?

1. “His heart is full of affectionate, soft and tender love.
2. “Evil is killed, destroyed, cast out from within him.
- 3, 4. “Pride and self-righteousness are put an end to and cast down.
5. “Stable, and strong, and established, and undying is his faith.
6. “He enters into the enjoyment of the heart’s refreshment, of the highly praised and desirable peace and bliss of the ecstasies of contemplation fully felt.
7. “He exhales the most excellent and unequalled scented savour of righteousness of life.

8. "Near is he and dear to gods and men alike.
 9. "Exalted by the best of beings, the Arahats Noble Ones themselves.
 10. "Gods and men delight to honour him.
 11. "The enlightened, wise, and learned approve, esteem, appreciate, and praise him.
 - 12, 13. "Untarnished is he by the love either of this world or the next.
 14. "He sees the danger in the smallest offence.
 15. "Rich is he in the best of wealth, the wealth that is the fruit of the Path, the wealth of those who are ever seeking the highest of the attainments.
 16. "He is a partaker of the best of the four requisites of a recluse that may be obtained by asking.
 17. "He lives without a home, addicted to that best austerity which is dependent on the meditation of the Jhanas.
 18. "He has unravelled the whole net of evil.
 - 19, 20. "He has broken and burst through, *doubled up*, and utterly destroyed both the possibility of rebirth in any of the five future states and the five obstacles to the higher life in this one (Lust, Malice, Sloth, Pride, and Doubt).
 - 21-23. "Unalterable in character, excellent in conduct, he transgresses none of the rules as to the four requisites of a recluse.
 24. "He is set free from rebirths.
 25. "He has passed beyond all perplexity.
 26. "His mind is set upon complete emancipation.
 27. "He has seen the Truth the sure and steadfast place of refuge from all fear has he gained.
 28. "The seven evil inclinations—to lust, and malice, and heresy, and doubt, and pride, and desire for future life, and ignorance—are rooted out in him.
 29. "He abounds in the bliss and the ecstasies of contemplation.
 30. "He is endowed with all the virtues a recluse should have.
- "These, O King, are the thirty graces he is adorned withal."

Of course it was not supposed that any man could spring into a condition of heart such as this without constant self-training and self-effort. It would be impossible to give you at any length the details of the method which was followed, but I can give you a specimen.

The Arahats, in order to acquire the first of the graces just mentioned,—that is, to have a heart full of affectionate, soft, and tender love towards all beings that have life,—will deliberately sit down and call to mind first, all those beings who are close to the spot where he is sitting, and will suffuse them as it were with a feeling of his love. This may take some time, for he has especially to call to mind any one with whom he may have had any difference or disagreement. But when he has, to his own satisfaction, practised love towards those in the locality where he is, he

then, continuing still to keep up that feeling, extends it in wider and ever wider circles. As the Mahâ-Sudassana says :—

“He let his mind pervade one-quarter of the world with thoughts of Love, and so the second quarter, and so the third, and so the fourth; and thus the whole wide world above, below, around, and everywhere did he continue to pervade with heart of Love, far-reaching, grown great, beyond measure, free from the least trace of anger or ill-will.”

There were similar established methods by which all the various graces of Arahatship could be obtained, and to have obtained them was the only salvation which the ideal Buddhist cared to seek. Of course many here in the West, caught in the machinery of those complex conditions which we are pleased to call civilization, occupied all their days in the moil and toil of life, devoted more or less to the worship of Mammon, of titles, and of force, swallowed up in the unworthy social struggles, the eager craving restlessness of our present conditions of existence, will think such efforts as these, such a method as this, impracticable, impossible,—even, perhaps, undesirable. But the present conditions of society in the West are not going to endure for ever. They, too, like everything else, are, as the Buddhists would say, a “Confection”; they are never the same for two consecutive weeks; they are changing and passing away, like everything else, before our very eyes. Let us hope that there will come a time when even the Englishman will be able to find time to devote himself to the “ecstasies of contemplation fully felt,”—will be able to turn aside from the slavery of money-getting to that higher life which all the deepest thinkers of the world have estimated as a higher gain than any of the things for which we struggle now. It is not probable that precisely the Buddhist solution of that higher life will ever be in its entirety adopted. But it must at least be admitted, not only that the ideal was a noble one, but that it was nobly carried out. It is certainly most interesting and instructive, that that scheme for a perfect life which has influenced more people than have ever been reached by Christianity, should have been founded upon the doctrine of Impermanence, and be altogether independent of the time-honoured belief in an everlasting and an unchanging existence, accompanied with a consciousness of identity, for each individual soul. To many of us here in the West such a belief seems devoid of hope. But is it really so? Must we have a belief in some personal happiness that we ourselves are to enjoy hereafter? The Buddhist would say that the hope is a delusion, born of delusion, and a fatal impediment to any real advance in ethics. Is it not enough to hope that our self-denials and our struggles will add to the happiness of others? Surely we have even so a gain far beyond our deserts, for we receive more, infinitely more, than we can ever give. We inherit the result of the Karma of the countless multitudes who have lived and died, who have struggled and suffered, struggled and suffered for us, in the long ages of the past. And if we can sometimes catch a glimpse of the glories that cer-

tainly lie hid behind the veil of the future, is it not better to let our hearts bathe themselves in the bliss of a gratitude that is real, because it rests upon facts, and then revel in the hope, stronger, deeper, purer than any selfishness can give, that our sufferings and struggles in their turn will do some little towards ennobling and beautifying the lives of those who are to follow after us

BUDDHA AND BUDDHISM

BY MRS. FREDERIKA MACDONALD.

No sight in India is more familiar, at the entrance of a native bazaar, or out amongst rice and maize fields, or by the dusty wayside, than the spreading Peepul, or Banyan tree, that marks the place of a temple or shrine. What the building beneath the tree may be, it is not easy to say from a distance. It may be the tomb of a Mussulman saint; or a Hindû temple worthy of the name; or merely some canopy of stone above a rough symbol of Siva or Ganesha. The sacred tree affords a shelter to any one of these structures, and sometimes even imperils their existence by a too puissant protection. For you have the strong boughs forcing their way through the temple roof, or sweeping down, laden with trailing creepers to conceal, and sometimes to efface, delicate carvings or interesting ancient inscriptions.

Now I am going to ask you to accept this sacred tree as an appropriate symbol of the overshadowing imagination of ancient India, deep-rooted in Pantheism, and flowering out into luxurious leafage and blossom of myth and legend. A shadow we must expect to find upon Buddhism as upon all the religions born beneath, or brought within reach of, its influence.

It is very necessary to keep this fact in remembrance. Buddhism is especially interesting amongst Indian religions, and indeed amongst the religions of the world, because it is the one great religion that dispenses with supernatural proofs and superhuman authority; and that appeals directly to Man himself, bidding him be his own reformer, ruler, and refuge. But whilst these are the essential and peculiar characteristics of Buddhism, they are not the characteristics that will first strike a Western student who commences his study of Indian religious thought with Buddhism. Unfortunately, this is a method too often followed. People, without any knowledge of Oriental philosophy or religious thought, happen to be attracted by some beautiful or touching legend about Gotama Buddha; or by some impressive text they hear quoted from the Buddhist scriptures; or, perhaps, these uninitiated inquirers are started upon the study of an unfamiliar subject by some curious resemblances they discover between the personal characters and histories of Buddha and Christ, or between the organization of early Buddhism and mediæval Christianity. And, forthwith, we have these new enthusiasts plunging into the study of the subject, and imagining that they can read up Buddhism in a week, or even in a day or so; and remaining all the time completely ignorant of

the fact that, in attempting to do this, they are beginning to read a long history at the closing chapters.

Now a great many mistakes, and some disappointments, are the results of this method of reading backwards; or, rather, I should say, of reading one isolated page torn out of a mighty volume. Readers of this sort cannot distinguish what is original and important in this special page from what are mere repetitions of, or improvements upon, old doctrines set forth in the earlier chapters. And what are the very first discoveries made by these adventurous students who run and read? Why, grotesque fables, monstrous, and sometimes puerile, tales concerning all manner of mythological personages, and fantastic legends, where the wild imagination of the East plays lawlessly amidst fine poetic dreams and mere barbarous absurdities! I do not at all wonder that such readers are tempted to decide off-hand that there must be either wilful disingenuousness or stupid obstinacy in critics who describe Buddhism as an intellectual *system independent of supernaturalism*. What, for instance, will the practical Western, who has started on this new voyage of discovery without any previous knowledge of the country he is about to explore, think of the future Founder of a pure religion of the intellect, who, to start with, enters his mother's side as a fine young white elephant with an abnormal number of tusks? Or, how will he reconcile the miraculous conceit of the infant Bodhisatva, asserting his claims, in the very hour of his birth, to be honoured as Lord of the Universe, with the humble and laborious patience of the Buddha—who proclaims himself "only a Teacher"; and who, having gained enlightenment himself, by no other means than those he urges other men to follow, declares that spiritual emancipation is no divine gift of grace, but the conquest of man's intellect and will, rightly ruled and directed by himself? It is true that some more enthusiastic than judicious admirers of Buddhism have their own way of explaining away these apparent contradictions. A deep mystical meaning, they assure us, lies hidden beneath these grotesque fables. But then they have still to reconcile this statement of theirs with the Buddha's own declaration that he had no esoteric doctrine, and that "his hand was not the closed fist of the teacher who keeps some things back." Again we have the explanation that recommends itself to the orthodox mind: the declaration that these childish and foolish superstitions, scattered amongst the noble truths of Buddhism, prove to what freaks and follies the wisest human minds are driven, when they presume to solve the problems of life, unaided by revelation.

Well, but I do not think that either of these explanations will be deemed necessary by students who approach the study of Buddhism from a right direction. The Orientalist who has traced the growth of noble thoughts, and the transformation of rude and barbarous traditions, can easily establish the true relationship the spiritual doctrine of Buddha has to the myths and legends that form a natural and necessary part of its

environment. As for white elephants with five tusks, and miraculously precocious infants, who speak as soon as they are born, and sometimes even earlier, he knows perfectly well what to make of these; he has met them scores of times before in the course of his wanderings through the "immense flowering forests" of old Indian poetry, the haunted region where he knows full well all Indian philosophy and religious thought were born. Therefore, his attention is not drawn aside when he meets with these familiar figures upon the threshold of Buddhism. He knows that he was in a certain sense bound to find them there. They are the conventional ornaments that adorn the portico of this Indian temple, as of other Indian temples. Outside adornments, that reveal the locality where the temple is reared, but that do not in any way express the spirit of the worship that is being carried on inside. Or let me return to my first simile: The initiated traveller recognises once again the shadow of the Indian sacred tree; and knowing where he stands, he is able to see the clear and shining mind of Buddha as a pool of pure deep water, that he can test and taste, and prove to have taken no taint or colour from the fantastic reflections cast upon its surface.

It is thus necessary that we should know something of the conditions of thought and feeling amidst which Buddhism arose, because without this knowledge we cannot properly distinguish between the spiritual doctrine and the alloy of old superstitions necessarily bound up with it. But this is not all. We cannot properly understand even the spiritual doctrine, unless we know something of the earlier religions in which Buddhism has its roots.

'For it is true of Buddha, as it is true of Christ, that he did not come to destroy the earlier Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them—in other words, Buddha, like Christ, was a spiritual liberator, who did not reject the doctrines he found in existence, but who laboured to spiritualize and perfect them, and to make men enslaved by formal dogmas free in their obedience to convictions made vital and inspiring. But we must not fall into the error of supposing that the "Law" spiritualized by Buddha was the same as the "Law" of the Hebrew Scriptures made more tender and humane by Christ. There are certain resemblances between Buddhism and Christianity that strike people at once. But a little reflection will show that these resemblances are only the necessary ones that must exist between two spiritual systems; that both have it for their purpose to lead men to a higher life than that of the lower passions and appetites. Apart from these common qualities, that belong to all the great world-religions, Buddhism and Christianity have no relationship to each other. So far from being one and the same, in method and goal, they are not even kindred religions. They are different religions, and from this cause—they spring from different sources. Christianity has its roots in Semitic monotheism; and the doctrines it inherits from Judaism make it necessarily a supernatural religion—because these doctrines put the

cause, the direction, and the goal of the Higher Life outside of the sphere where the mind and will of man have power. Buddhism has its roots in Aryan pantheism; and the fundamental doctrines it inherits from Brahmanism leave it independent of supernaturalism, because these doctrines make the cause, the direction, and the goal of the Higher Life belong to the spirit that animates and moves the soul in man.

I am insisting upon this so much because here, too, we are face to face with an amiable blunder that has done a great deal to produce misapprehensions and disappointment; because it has set people looking for something in Buddhism they cannot find there, and has turned their eyes away from the spiritual possessions that actually belong to this religion—possessions that belong, as I have said, to no other religion in the world. The blunder of which I am speaking is, of course, the supposition that in Buddha we have an Indian Christ, whose history and whose mission may be traced along lines parallel to those of the Founder of Christianity. Now, no more unsatisfactory and unsatisfying view can possibly be taken of the teaching of Buddha than the one derived by studying this Religion from the above standpoint. *If you go to Buddhism hoping to find in it what the sincere Christian finds in Christianity, you will, and must, be disappointed.* As a counterpart of Christianity, Buddhism is distinctly unsatisfactory. It does *not* give you any authoritative account of the creation of the world, nor of the means by which sin and death first came to spoil the perfect order of things; it does *not* promise you, in return for your prayers, exemption from pain and evil, nor any support, nor favourable interference on your behalf on the part of the Divine Powers. Buddha does not proclaim himself a Saviour willing and able to take upon his shoulders the sins of the whole world. On the contrary, he declares that each man must bear the burden of his own sins; in other words, that there is no remission of sins, but only expiation. So far from promising to save his disciples by his merits from the effects of their misdeeds, he declares that no god, even, can do for any man that work of self-conquest and self-emancipation that, in the religion of Buddha, stands for "salvation." "*By oneself the evil is done,*" says Buddha; "*by oneself one suffers. By oneself evil is left undone; by oneself one is purified. Purity and impurity belong to oneself; no one can purify another.*"—DHAMMAPADA, 163.

So that those who expect to find in Buddha more than a guide to the right path that they must tread themselves, will be disappointed. Again, the goal and reward of the Higher Life in Buddhism is not in any external state, but in the attainment of a tranquil and perfect mind. Thus, students who persist in regarding Nirvana as a sort of Buddhist Heaven, are necessarily disappointed. Here is no new Jerusalem, no Holy City with "gates of pearl," and streets of "pure gold as it were transparent glass." No wonder the good Bishop Bigandet, after seeking in vain for some such lovely pictures of the Buddhist Paradise, concludes his very

favourable report upon the moral aspects of this religion, with the declaration that "by an inexplicable and a deplorable eccentricity this system merely promises men as a reward for their moral efforts the bottomless gulf of annihilation."

But if you will not find in Buddhism the promise of miraculous consolations that only a supernatural religion can venture to hold out, you *will* find the encouraging and ennobling faith that man has, within himself, a strength and virtue that can render him independent of all such consolations. Buddhism, as I have said, stands out as the one religion that bids man *trust himself*, that calls upon him to raise himself by his own strength; to govern and control and form himself; that assures him not only that there is no strength outside of himself to help him, but also none that can prevail against him, if he conquer and hold the sovereignty over himself. "*Not even a god can change into defeat the victory of a man who has vanquished himself.*"—DHAMMAPADA, 105.

Buddhism is the one religion that has preached this. Philosophy, of course, has taught the same lesson; but then philosophy is not religion. Philosophy at best brings resignation, teaching men to endure the evils of life. But religion does more than this. Religion brings spiritual enthusiasm and joy, carrying men through these material pains and evils, and leaving them their conquerors. And Buddhism does this: it has the animating enthusiasm and fervour that belong to a Religion, although the system it kindles (or, as Matthew Arnold would have said, "lights up with emotion") is a system founded upon self-reliance, having its method in self-conquest and self-culture, and its goal in self-deliverance, and a refuge for man from the attacks of his own lower passions and from the evils of the world, in the "safe asylum" of an intellectual and spiritual life.

But you may ask, "Is this Religion of pure intelligence actually Buddhism as taught by Buddha seven hundred years before Christ?" Until recently, travellers and commentators were wont to speak of Buddhism as the most mysterious and inexplicable religion in the world. And now, when it is shown us as this simple and luminous system, that bears so strange a resemblance to the most enlightened idealism of our own day, can we feel sure that no modern gloss has been put upon this ancient faith, and no spiritual meaning imparted to it, that its first founders never thought or dreamed of? We have these suspicions expressed plainly enough by some critics, who have not hesitated to accuse the accomplished Orientalist to whom modern students of Buddhism are most indebted—I mean, of course, Dr. Rhys Davids—of holding the insane belief that "Gotama Buddha was the Positivist Auguste Comte, born two thousand years too soon!"

Now the best answer to these wild assertions is to state plainly what it is that Dr. Rhys Davids—in conjunction, of course, with Professor Max Müller, Dr. Buhler, Dr. Fausbøll, and other eminent scholars—what it is that these men have done to revolutionize the whole study of Buddhism.

We should recognise that they have not put forward any new arbitrary personal opinions of their own, opposed to the views of earlier scholars. What they have done is to put the Western reader, who is ignorant of Eastern languages, in a position to judge for himself what Buddhism actually was. The magnificent series of translations from the most ancient Buddhist scriptures, that we owe to the patient and disinterested labours of Dr. Rhys Davids especially give us an opportunity of studying at first hand, if not the actual doctrine as taught by Buddha himself, at any rate the doctrine that early Indian Buddhists believed that he taught at the period when they first compiled and wrote down the reported sayings and doings of their revered Master.

The *Pitakas*, or *Baskets of the Law*, are to Buddhism very much what the Gospels are to Christianity. Because modern commentators point out discrepancies in the Gospels, and declare that on matters of doctrine, and even upon questions of facts, there are differences between the four narratives that make it difficult to suppose they were written by the apostles whose names they bear—because of all this, the fact is not changed that we have in the Gospels the oldest and most authoritative record of the life and teachings of Christ. In the same way, there is great improbability that the Buddhist *Pitakas*, as we now have them, were compiled by men who had been hearers and eye-witnesses of all they record; and yet it is in these *Pitakas* that we have the earliest and most authoritative account of Buddha's teaching now in existence: and we are therefore bound to accept the evidence of these ancient Scriptures as giving us the nearest approach now possible to a just and adequate knowledge of Buddhism as taught by Buddha.

And it is in these ancient Scriptures especially that we have this pure intellectual faith shining out distinct and clear, like some brilliant gem in a quaintly beautiful setting of fantastic myths and legends. How noble, high, and tranquil is the mind of the Eastern sage that speaks through these old discourses! And, strangest of all, how directly his voice speaks to us men and women of the modern world! We lose count of the centuries as we read and listen; it is hard to realize that these familiar thoughts, that almost seem our own, were recited in dim ages and remote climes by yellow-robed Bhikshus, hidden away in caverns in the rocks or forest mountains; to picture to ourselves how they were first written down by patient scribes on palm leaves; how savage kings rested from their wars and cruelties to collect these faded manuscripts; how ignorant priests treasured them as charms, when they had lost the art of deciphering the learned characters, or of applying the noble lessons. And then, at last, how the buried spirit of a vanished world was discovered and released by generous and disinterested Western scholars! We forget this long winding stream of human lives down which these noble thoughts have journeyed to us. As Emerson says, "They have no antiquity for us." They seem an echo of our own best thoughts.

And now, before looking more closely into these *Baskets of the Law*, let us see how and by whom the *Baskets* were, in the first instance, collected and filled. Here, as I have already told you, we have to trust to the beautiful and touching old legends of Buddhist traditions. According to these legends, a short time after the Master's death, when, in the language of the Tibetan *Dulwā*, the "lamp of wisdom had been blown out by the wind of impermanency," there arose certain disputes amongst the brethren concerning matters of doctrine. To settle these disputes, the first Council was called together, at Rajagaha, near Magadha. Then, when the whole Order was assembled, Kasyapa (counted the most learned amongst Buddha's disciples) was commanded to recite the metaphysical or philosophical doctrine, set forth in the *Abidharma Pitaka*. Afterwards, the oldest disciple, Upali by name, was called upon to repeat the laws and rules of discipline, and the circumstances that led to their establishment; and these rules of discipline were henceforth known as the *Vinaya Pitaka*. Then, lastly, the disciple whom Buddha had most loved, Ananda, the St. John of Buddhism, was charged to repeat the *Sutta Pitaka*; or the Parables and Sermons he had heard delivered at various times by the Lord. At first, these sacred texts do not appear to have been written down. They were committed to memory, and recited constantly by members of the Order; and even when the second Buddhist Council was held, a hundred years after the first Council, there is no evidence to show that any written Scriptures were in existence. The first proof that there were such written Scriptures is to be found in the edict of King Asoka, given B.C. 242, commanding that the Sacred Books of the Law of Buddha should be forthwith collected.

Now you will easily understand that the *Sutta Basket*, the one containing the account of Buddha's sermons and parables, will naturally be the one laden with things most precious. It was of the *Suttas* especially that I was thinking when I said that the modern Western reader finds that Buddhism has "no antiquity for him." In the *Dhammapada*, Buddha's words strike as directly home to the heart of the modern idealist as Emerson's words, or Carlyle's, or Goethe's, or any words uttered by the most essentially "modern" of our prophets. I hope that those of you who have not read the *Dhammapada*, will let me persuade you to study the admirable translation of that noble book given by Professor Max Müller, in Volume X. of the *Sacred Books of the East*. I do not understand how any thoughtful or intelligent reader of the *Dhammapada*, who, before starting upon the study of this work, has cleared his mind of preconceived notions concerning the resemblances between Buddhism and Christianity, can rise from its perusal without feeling that he has gained a perfectly clear comprehension of the foundations, the method, and the goal of the Higher Life of Buddhism. Indeed, the *Dhammapada* has clearly been compiled with the intention of giving the weaker brethren, who feel themselves incapable of committing the whole contents of the three *Pitakas* to

memory, a summary of the essential principles of Buddha's doctrine. The *Suttas* here brought together were preached by Buddha on various occasions, and at different periods of his career; but they all deal with matters concerning the elements of the faith, and the training of the disciple in holy living; and are distinguished by the simplicity and directness of a religion whose concern is with the moral nature and mind of man, and not with theories that explain the miraculous creation of the physical universe, or predictions that foretell the conditions of a future state that lies beyond the sphere of human experience.

It is impossible in a lecture of this sort to attempt to give any idea of the beautiful and remarkable texts enshrined in every one of the twenty *Suttas* that form the *Dhammapada*. Here are a few verses taken almost at random :—

"All that we are is the result of what we have thought. It is founded on our thoughts; it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speak or act with an evil thought, pain follows him as the wheel follows the foot of the ox that draws the carriage." (Verse 1.)

"Well-makers lead the water wherever they like; fletchers bend the arrow; carpenters shape the log of wood; the wise man fashions himself." (Verse 195.)

"If one man conquer in battle a thousand times ten thousand men, and another man conquer himself, he (the last) is the greatest conqueror." (Verse 103.)

"Self is the Lord of Self; who else should be the Lord? With Self well subdued, a man finds a Lord, such as few can find.

"Mules are good if tamed, and noble Sindhu horses, and elephants with large tusks; but he who tames himself is better still. For with those animals does no man reach the untrodden country (Nirvana) where a tamed man goes on a tamed animal, namely, on his well-tamed self." (Verses 322, 323.)

"O Bhikshu, empty this boat! If emptied, it will go quickly; having cut off passion and hatred, thou wilt go to Nirvana." (Verse 369.)

"And this is the beginning here for a wise Bhikshu: Watchfulness over the senses; restraint under the law; keep noble friends whose life is pure and who are not slothful; dwell constantly upon the highest thoughts.

"Rouse thyself by thyself; examine thyself by thyself; thus, self-protected and attentive, wilt thou live happily, O Bhikshu!

"For Self is the Lord of Self. Self is the refuge of Self: therefore curb thyself, as the merchant curbs a good horse." (Verses 375-80.)

In the *Dhammapada* we have what may be called essentially the *moral and religious principles* of Buddhism. For the *methods of philosophical*

argument, and the intellectual foundations upon which this religion of pure reason is built, we must consult three other very important *Suttas*, that have all been translated by Dr. Rhys Davids; and will be found in Volume XI. of the *Sacred Books of the East*. These three *Suttas* are:—

1. The *Sutta* entitled *The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness*;
2. The *Sutta*, *On the Knowledge of the Vedas*;
3. The *Book of the Great Decease*.

The *Sutta* entitled *The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness* may be described as the manifesto of the faith. It was the first sermon preached by Gotama, after his attainment of the Buddha-hood; and it gained for him his first disciples. Those amongst you who have read Sir Edwin Arnold's *Light of Asia* will remember who those first disciples were. They were those five Bhikshus who had attached themselves to Gotama, in the days when he sought enlightenment by practising severe self-macerations in the depths of the savage forest. These were the methods recommended by the Brahmins whom Prince Gotama consulted, when, driven by a sense of the vanity and misery of the earthly existence, he had abandoned his father's palace and all the affections and enjoyments that bound him to his home; to seek, if haply he might find it, some remedy for the sickness unto death that he felt weighing upon himself and all around him. The five Bhikshus had also abandoned the worldly life, driven into the forest by much the same soul-sickness; only the Bhikshus did not hope themselves to attain enlightenment, they were in hopes of meeting some holy recluse who would become their "Guru," or Spiritual Director. At first, they imagine they have found the Holy Man they are in search of, when they behold Gotama's emaciated form, and witness day after day the courage and devotion he displays in leading the life of an ascetic. But the five Bhikshus go away offended when, after a time, Gotama, finding that all his fastings and penitential exercises bring him no illumination, abandons his solitary cavern, and follows again the practice of the other religious mendicants, who daily visit the villages and beg for food.

The disappointed disciples, who have silently attended upon the recluse for six years, say one to another: "It is vain that the Rahan Gotama has during six years of self-maceration and suffering sought for spiritual enlightenment; he has now joined the other Mendicants and goes forth, as they do, in search of food! As the man who wants water to refresh his forehead must seek for the cool stream or the pure, untainted well, so must we go elsewhere in search of the knowledge of the true Path that we can never obtain from him." So they take up their staves and their alms-bowls, and set off in the direction of Benares; and finding no help anywhere, they make themselves a hermitage in the Deer Forest called Migadaya. And it is here, after he has attained the Buddha-hood, that their old Master finds them. He remembers their long and patient waiting for the truth; he is moved to compassion by the recollection of how they went empty away, and therefore he starts forth in search of them. As he enters the

Deer Forest the five Bhikshus recognise him, and say one to the other, "Behold! Here is this renegade, this castaway!" and they resolve to receive him with rudeness. But when he stands before them, the beauty of the Buddha's countenance, and the shining calm it wears, fill them with amazement; and as they stand there, not knowing whether to cover him with revilings or to fall at his feet in worship, the Master preaches to them this beautiful sermon, *The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness*, and at its conclusion the five Bhikshus with one accord cry aloud:—"In Benares, at the Hermitage of the Migadaya, the supreme wheel of the Empire of Truth has been set rolling by the Blessed One; that wheel which not by any Sramana or Brahmana,¹ not by Brahma with Mara, can ever be turned back."

What then is this "Foundation" upon which the Kingdom of Righteousness rests? Nothing can be simpler, more intelligible, less "mystical," in the sense given to the word "mystical" by certain muddleheaded critics, who are pleased to suppose that this high and noble Religion of the Irreluctant was the screen for some secret systems of complicated ceremonials, and of the study and practice of magic—and that the Buddha, "the Enlightened One," was in reality a Prophet of Darkness, *i.e.* of occultism; in other words, a powerful wizard, instead of a moral reformer and philosopher! The foundations of Buddha's kingdom are upon the recognition of the causes of suffering and evil; and then, upon the recognition of the means of escape from these evils. In Buddhist phraseology, we must first of all recognise the *Four Noble Truths concerning Suffering*; and then we must resolutely train ourselves to tread, with faultless perseverance, the *Noble Eightfold Path* that will lead us into a sphere where suffering and evil cannot overtake us. You must remember that Buddha inherited from Brahmanism the doctrine that personal existence, the life of the senses and emotions, is the sphere of "impermanency," the domain of Maya-Illusion. Buddha declares that pain and evil exist only in this sphere; that men are subject to pain and evil because they are under the dominion of sensual passions and selfish desires, that bind them and hold them as prisoners to the personal state. He declares that men can break these bonds, and open the door of their prison, if they will resolutely endeavour to resist selfish desires and passions, and to translate their interests and affections from the troubled sphere of sense and emotion into the tranquil sphere of mind and spirit. The method by which this work of self-emancipation is brought to a successful end is shown in the discourses connected with the Noble Eightfold Path. This Noble Eightfold Path is, as Dr. Rhys Davids says, "the very pith of Buddhism." The eight foot-steps in the Path are as follows:—

1. Right views (free from superstition or delusion).
2. Right aims (worthy of the intelligent man).

¹ That is to say, not by any miracle-worker or dogmatic priest; nor by any god or devil.

3. Right speech (kindly, open, truthful).
4. Right conduct (peaceful, honest, pure).
5. Right livelihood (bringing hurt and danger to no living thing).
6. Right effort (self-control).
7. Right mindfulness (the active watchful mind).
8. Right contemplation (on the deep mysteries of life).

Now, one has only to read over carefully these eight conditions belonging to the path of spiritual progress, to dismiss once and for all the accusation sometimes made against Buddhism, that, by placing the goal of the Higher Life in the attainment of a perfect mind, it tends to make the cultivation of intellectual gifts of more importance than the acquirement of moral virtues. In the *Suttas* that treat of this doctrine of the Noble Eightfold Path, it becomes especially clear that under the method of Buddha the conscience and intellect are brought under one and the same rule. Nothing can be more absurd in Buddhism than to speak of the higher wisdom as though it were something preferred above morality and virtue, since obedience to the moral law is one of the conditions that must be fulfilled before the mind is in a fit state to take even the first steps towards this higher wisdom. The religious life is a life suitable to a being who has become purely intelligent; but this life cannot be entered upon by the undisciplined, who have not trained themselves yet in obedience to the ordinary laws of morality.

In the *Dhammapada*, and in the *Sutta, The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness*, we have the positive side of Buddha's doctrine. In the *Sutta, On the Knowledge of the Vedas*, we have the negative side; and this *Sutta* should serve to show also Buddha's method of dealing with contemporary beliefs, of rejecting what in them was merely formal and superstitious, and of giving a new spiritual importance to what in them was true and helpful. This *Sutta* commences with a very pretty picture of the life of the India of Buddha's day.

Two young Brahmins, who have just performed the sacred ablutions that symbolize the purification of the soul, are walking upon the borders of a forest, inhabited by many holy anchorites and ascetics. The two young men are engaged in religious talk; and the subject that occupies them is the method by which union with "Brahm" can be most surely attained. The union of the individual soul with Brahm, the divine Soul of the universe, is the aim and purpose of the religious life in Brahmanism. Now it happens that the two youths have been under the spiritual direction of different "Gurus" or teachers; they have therefore different views of the penitential exercises and religious observances most efficacious in bringing about this mystical "Union" that both regard as the Supreme Good. As they cannot come to any agreement, they decide to submit their quarrel to a Holy Man who has recently come, with a body of his disciples, to sojourn in the forest, a teacher of whose marvellous wisdom and eloquence they both have heard. This teacher,—who wanders about from place to place to "instruct,

arouse, incite, and gladden men with religious discourse,"—is none other than Gotama Buddha himself. The two young men then come to the Holy Man of whose name they have heard, and the Lord Buddha receives them kindly. When they have laid their difficulty before him, he begins, much after the manner of Socrates, to question those who have come to question him. So, then, these learned Brahmins have both laid down different paths that they say lead to union with Brahm? But now, do these guides know precisely where this Brahm, to whom they will conduct their disciples, actually dwells? Have these favoured mortals seen Brahm at any time? Have they themselves found him? The young men are compelled to acknowledge that the Brahmins have not seen or found Brahm. And Gotama has made his first point. "So, then," he says, "the Brahmins versed in the three Vedas have, forsooth I said thus:—'What we know not, what we have not seen, to a state of union with that we can show the way.'" The young men admit the case looks much like that. "Well," but Gotama continues, "they and all men have seen the sun shining in the sky: can they now teach men to unite themselves to the sun that they see, and whose light and warmth they feel?" The young Brahmins reply that "the sun is remote from men; and of a different nature from men, and that therefore union between men and that bright luminary is impossible." Here Buddha has hold of the clue he needs. "So, then, only beings that are of one nature can be united? But although men know not the form and dwelling of Brahm, they know something, do they not, of the nature of Brahm? Is Brahm, for instance, proud, avaricious, quick to anger, impure? Has he, or has he not, self-mastery? The young Brahmins answer at once, that Brahm has self-mastery, that he is free from pride, avarice, anger, impurity. "And how about the Brahmins," Buddha asks, "who profess to show the way to union with Brahm?" The young men are bound to admit that the Brahmins are avaricious, prone to anger, often impure, deficient in self-mastery. "Very good," Gotama continues; "that these Brahmins, versed in the Vedas, and yet bearing anger and malice in their hearts, sinful and uncontrolled, should after death, when the body is dissolved, become united to Brahm, who is free from anger and malice, sinless, and has self-mastery—such a condition of things has no existence. So that thus the Brahmins, versed though they be in the three Vedas, while they sit down in confidence, are sinking down in the mire; and so sinking, they are arriving only at despair, thinking the while that they are crossing over into some happier land."

And then Buddha goes on to prove that the true and sure method of preparation for union with Brahm is to make one's mind perfect, even as the mind of Brahm. And he proceeds to set forth three sets of rules of conduct—the first, for those who will be blameless; the second, binding on those who will be virtuous; the third, necessary for those who choose to be perfect and to lead the Higher Life, whose goal is Nirvana, or the becoming of one mind and soul with the perfect Brahm. The first set of

rules consists of the ordinary moral laws of purity, freedom from cruelty, covetousness, and deeds of violence. The second set of rules are strict enough to satisfy most Western standards of perfection. The virtuous man must renounce worldly ambition, and all luxurious tastes, and unprofitable amusements; he must refrain from idle, as well as mischievous, words; indeed, the topics of conversation permitted him must leave him a silent member of any society composed of average human beings. He must not "gossip about great people"; he must not speak at all about meats, drinks, clothes, couches, perfumes, equipages, women, warriors, demi-gods, fortune-telling, hidden treasures, ghost-stories, nor about empty tales concerning things that are and things that are not." If these are the difficulties that lie in the way of those who desire to be virtuous, how much harder are the counsels of perfection given to those who aspire to lead the Higher Life! The truly religious man, Buddha declares, has elected to live for the things of the mind and the spirit alone; he must not only keep himself unspotted from the world, he must also withdraw himself from all those low arts and lying practices that win reverence from men, but that form no part of the spiritual vocation. The true Bhikshu, Buddha declares, is no diviner of dreams; he utters no spells or incantations; he does not indulge in prophecies; he must not occupy himself with astrology; he must not lay claim to powers of miraculous healing; he must not profess to discover magical virtue in gems, or weapons, or any material objects: in a word, his work is in the spiritual and intellectual sphere, and not amidst the mere vain show of things that tricks and bewilders men's senses, but that the true sage knows has no real existence. Buddha's attitude towards miracles and miracle-workers is so plainly set forth in this and other *Suttas*, that one can but marvel at the astonishing audacity of the modern restorers of worn-out and mischievous superstitions, who attempt to shelter their efforts to revive the belief in magic, in full nineteenth century, behind the name of the Great Wise Man of the East, who most resolutely resisted these "low arts and lying practices" as unworthy of the truly religious man. It is true that Buddha's attitude towards miracles is not precisely the modern attitude. He does not say, with Matthew Arnold, that "the main objection to miracles is, that they do not happen." Neither does he hold, with the founders of the Psychical Research Society, that the question whether miracles do or do not happen is one worthy of discussion and investigation. He makes it very plain that he does not consider the question of any consequence at all. Whether miracles do or do not happen is a matter of no importance, from the spiritual point of view, and to the man occupied with spiritual concerns, since phenomena, occult or otherwise, belong to the sphere of Maya illusion, that the truly enlightened man knows to be a mere passing and deceiving dream.

And again, in *The Book of the Great Decease*, we find a plain and direct statement that contradicts, in language unmistakably clear and convincing, the assumption that Buddha taught any secret doctrine to his favourite

disciples during his lifetime, or left any so-called "esoteric" faith to be treasured and handed down by a select band, but held back from what the author of "Esoteric Buddhism" delights to describe as the "vulgar herd." When Ananda, the beloved disciple, sees that the Master is brought by old age and sickness near to death, he waits anxiously for his opportunity to entreat that the "Blessed One" will not pass away from existence until he has given some instructions as touching the Order. And the aged Buddha answers the request with much the same gentle reproach that Jesus uses in His—"Have I been so long time with thee, and hast thou not known Me?"

"What then, Ananda; does the Order expect this of me? I have preached the truth without making any distinction between exoteric and esoteric doctrine; for in respect of the truth, Ananda, the *Tathâgata* has no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher who holds some things back. Surely, Ananda, should there be any one who harbours the thought, 'It is I who will lead the Brotherhood,' or 'The Order is dependent upon me,' it is he who should lay down instructions in any matter concerning the Order. The *Tathâgata* thinks not, Ananda, that he should lead the Brotherhood, or that the Brotherhood is dependent upon him. Why, then, should he leave instructions in any matter concerning the Order? . . .

"Therefore, O Ananda, be ye lamps unto yourselves. Be ye a refuge to yourselves. Hold fast to the truth as a lamp. Hold fast as a refuge to the truth. Look not for refuge to any one beside yourselves. . . .

". . . And whosoever, Ananda, either now or after I am dead, shall be a lamp unto themselves, and a refuge unto themselves . . . it is they, Ananda, among my Bhikshus who shall reach the very topmost height—but they must be anxious to learn."

Here, then, in the words that close Buddha's mission to men, we have stated once again the doctrine of self-deliverance by the method of self-culture and self-control. Let me, in conclusion, quote the beautiful verses that recur over and over again, in different *Suttas*, like a song of triumph celebrating the conquest of selfish desires; and proving that the emancipation from selfishness does not mean the extinction of human sympathy:—

"Verily," the Buddha declares, "this is the sort of goodness that the perfect Bhikshu has. He lets his mind pervade one quarter of the world with thoughts of love, pity, sympathy, and equanimity; and so the second, and so the third, and so the fourth. . . .

"Just as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard, and that without difficulty, in all the four directions, so of all things that have shape or life there is not one that he passes by or leaves aside; but regards them all with heart of love, pity, and equanimity, far-reaching, grown great, and beyond measure."

BUDDHISM IN CHINA.

BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL BEAL.

THE spiritual activity of which I am going to speak is evidenced in the literature produced, and the energy displayed, by the Buddhist community in China, through many centuries of neglect and persecution. We wish to find out the secret of this *energy*, resulting in the activity alluded to.

The Chinese people are naturally sluggish in their ways of thought, and tenacious of old customs. Confucius, their national teacher, and the example they hold up for all ages, was, strictly speaking, a preserver of old thoughts and doctrines; he originated very little. There was nothing spiritual in his teaching; he avoided all reference to religion; he regarded Life, existing Life, as the right object of study; he looked on man as a member of society; and his aim was to show that man by complete sincerity may give full development to his nature and become the equal of heaven and earth. It is plain he rather retarded than promoted the spiritual activity of which the mind of man is capable, when set free from the trammels of artificial restraints.

Taouism, the teaching of Laou-tseu, the old philosopher, who was born perhaps fifty years before Confucius, or about six hundred years B.C., is an obscure system of transcendental philosophy. Its founder no doubt was a great awakener of thought, but the activity which he developed was more of a philosophical or mystic character. His system has been called a purely politico-ethical one. Confucius tried to reform the empire by the imposition of forms and artificial rules, Laou-tseu tried to go back to the state of primitive society before forms were, and before regulations existed. He held fast to three precious things—compassion, economy, humility; and by these he taught the people that they might return home to Taou; that is, as it seems, the original and simplest principle of purity and wisdom. He was, strictly speaking, a reformer, not after the type of Confucius, who went back to the condition of things in times of Yaou and Shun, and took those times as the model for imitation; but he boldly recurred to the time when the sovereigns possessed Taou, and ruled over a peaceful and contented empire; he opposed what has been called educational activity, and settled down to find out, already in himself, the ideal of man's perfection in the unalloyed simplicity of an original perfection.

There had been a good deal of *material* activity in China down to the time of the building of the Great Wall, in the reign of the first Universal Emperor She-hwang-ti, about 209 B.C. The great Yu had drained off the waters of the Yellow River, and redeemed a vast area from the condition

of a swamp to the richest land of the empire ; the Great Canal, seven hundred miles in length, with its embankments, flood-gates, and bridges, is a marvel of engineering skill ; the system of tillage and irrigation of their high-level fields exhibited not only the ingenuity of the people but their mechanical skill, whilst the crowning work—the building of the Great Wall—was a gigantic and successful undertaking, showing us what such a people can do when rightly, or rather doggedly, directed by a mind capable of conceiving such a scheme.

I need not refer to the *intellectual* activity of the great mass of the people, in their wonderful development of a native literature. It would occupy too much time even to glance at this feature of their character. I may only say that there is wanting in all this exhibition of material and intellectual progress any sign of spiritual life or aspiration ; the sight is that of a people struggling forward on one uniform line of social development, bent only on the happiness of the greater number, careless about the elevation of the race or the cultivation of the latent powers of our spiritual nature.

A knowledge of Buddhism and its origin was arrived at by the Chinese in the following way :—There had been an irruption of some barbarous people, bordering on the north and north-west of China, about the year 200 B.C., on the territories of another people known as the Yue-ti, or Yue-chi, who had by steps and degrees advanced from the mountainous region of Central Asia towards the borders of China. These latter people were driven back by the Northern barbarians, who now became a terror to the Chinese themselves. Accordingly in the reign of Wu-ti, of the Han dynasty, 140 B.C., a celebrated minister called Chang-ki'en, was sent to the far west as an envoy to the Yue-ti, with a view to arouse them to resist the advance of the victorious Tartars on the West, whilst the Chinese attacked them on the East. His mission was unsuccessful, but after various adventures he returned to his country, having been the first native of China, so far as is known, to penetrate to the Caspian Sea on the West. Shortly after this, viz., B.C. 123, a celebrated general, Ho-ku-ping, was sent by the same Emperor Wu-ti to operate against the barbarians before alluded to, over whom he gained brilliant victories, and in B.C. 121 he penetrated with his army one thousand *li*, i.e. some two hundred miles, beyond the borders of Turkestan, into probably the Kashgar or Yarkand territory, or perhaps so far as Baktra, from which place he brought back as a trophy a golden image, as it is said, of Buddha. This was the first intimation, as it seems, of the religion of Buddha in China.

This golden or gilded image was, however, to lead to great consequences—for, after the lapse of some fifty years, *i.e.* in the year 65 A.D., a mission was sent to the Western world, to find out more of the subject. The Emperor Ming-ti had, as related, seen a vision during his sleep, in which he beheld a golden messenger flying through space and entering his palace. There are two versions of this story : the first tells us that the Emperor in

his dream saw a golden image about nineteen feet in height, resplendent and with a halo bright as the sun, enter his palace. This vision the *literati* interpreted as referring to Buddha, a thought doubtless suggested by the golden image brought back by Ho-ku-ping. A second version says that the golden spirit itself spoke to the Emperor, and said: "Buddha bids you send to the Western countries and search for him, with a view to obtain books and images."

Be this as it may, I observe that this story has a non-Chinese origin; the idea of an angel or messenger flying from heaven, and revealing itself by a dream, is evidently of Persian extraction. The Chinese at this time had gained a knowledge of Persia; the astrology and astronomy of that country had already penetrated so far; and now the intervention of heavenly messengers for the first time is heard of. There was a nascent sense of the supernatural in mundane things beginning to be developed, leading to active results; and its origin I take to be in the growing intercourse of China with the West, and especially the borders of Media and Persia. In consequence of the vision he had seen, the Emperor immediately sent Ts'ai Yin, Tsing King, and Wang Tsun, with fifteen others, as envoys to India, to search for and bring back books, and, if possible, Buddhist priests from India. They reached the land of the Yue-ti, *i.e.* the Vajjis, and after some years' absence returned home with books and images or pictures from the frontier of India, accompanied by two teachers or priests, called respectively Saddharma and Kasyapa Matanga. These foreign teachers took up their residence at Loyang, and translated several books, or at any rate compiled them, among which were two I will name—*i.e.* the *Sūtra of Forty-two Paragraphs* and the *Life of Buddha*.

The *Sūtra of Forty-two Paragraphs* is an epitome of Buddhist ethics. It was a compilation, not a translation. Its teaching is purely practical: to avoid evil to do good; to banish lust and impure desire from the heart; to progress in the path of righteous doing—these and other duties are named, and the authority of Buddha in each case is quoted; thus:

"Buddha said: 'A man who rudely grasps or longs for wealth and pleasure is like a child coveting honey surrounding a knife—scarcely has he had one taste of its sweetness before he perceives the pain of his wounded tongue.'"

"Again, Buddha said: 'A religious person, or a person practising religious duties, should regard himself as an ox carrying a load through the mud—tired out with his exertions, he presses onward, not daring to turn either to the right hand or the left, till he escapes from it and finds rest. So the religious man regards his passions and bodily desires as worse than the mud, and bends his whole soul to the pursuit of the Path, and so longs to escape from sorrow.'"

The *form* of these paragraphs is perhaps borrowed from the usual style of the Confucian books, which generally begin, at least in the *Analects*, with the phrase, "The Master said"—meaning Confucius. And so here

each of the forty two paragraphs begins with the words : "Buddha said." There is no such method, as far as my reading goes, known in the original works of Buddhism, so that we must presume the style was borrowed from the native literature of China, with a view to commend it to the people. But on the other hand we may notice that this style of composition is the usual one in the edicts of Darius. Thus, in the Behistun inscription, we read :—

"Thus says Darius the King : 'My father was Hystaspis,' etc.

"And says Darius the King : 'By the grace of Ormazd I am King,' etc.

"And says Darius the King : 'These are the countries which are called mine,' etc.

"And says Darius the King : 'Within these countries whoever was pious, to them I afforded protection; whoever was impious I have punished,' etc.

I only quote these clauses to show the general agreement in *composition* betwixt the paragraphs of the Buddhist *Sûtra* and the paragraphs of the edicts of Darius.

But I trace also a parallel between the moral or ethical *doctrines* laid down in this early Buddhist compilation, and the morality or system of morals which characterizes the Iranian or *Persian* system derived from the primitive teaching of Zoroaster. "Zoroaster (we are told by Mr. Mills, the latest exponent of his teaching) was only a link in a far-extended chain of teachers, who had risen at various times to reform or instruct the nations. His system, like those of his predecessors and successors, was a growth. His main conceptions had been surmised, though not spoken, before. The world was ripe for them, and when he appeared he had only to utter and develop them. I would not call him a Reformer; he does not repudiate his predecessors; the old Aryan gods retire before the spiritual Ahura, but I do not think he specially intended to discredit them. But the great Benevolence, Order, and Power, together with their results in the human subject, *i.e.* Ahura's piety, incarnate in men, and their weal and immortality in consequence, crowd out all other thoughts."—(*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxi. *Preface*.)

Again, the same writer says, with regard to the Zoroastrian doctrine, that "it includes this fundamental principle: There can be no happiness undefined by sorrow, and no goodness which does not resist sin. Accordingly, the evil principle is so necessary that it is represented by an evil god. His very name, however, is a thought or a passion."—(*Ibid.*)

The same truths or principles are distinctly laid down in the Buddhist system, as it is exhibited in Chinese writings; Buddha was *the enlightened one*: "the wisdom and piety which may become incarnate in men" was engendered in him as it was in Zaratushtre. He expressly taught that he was only one in a succession of enlightened teachers, he was the *Tathâgata*, *i.e.* the One who came as his predecessor, the *Rightly Come*. He

did not reject the old gods of the people, Brahmâ Sahampati, Indra the Ruler of Heaven (or, of *Devas*), and so on; but he superseded them by the spiritual conception of a perfect Righteousness incarnate in each Buddha. The great Benevolence, Order, and Power are leading thoughts in his system; several temples in China are called the Great Benevolence or Loving-kindness Temples.¹ The "Order," or "Divine Order," is exhibited in the very name of *Dharma*, and the regular constitution of the *Community*; and the Power of the all-powerful one, the Dasabâla, or the tenfold strong one, is constantly attributed as one of the Buddha's attributes. Then again, as to the results in the human subject, their weal and immortality, Buddha's teaching expressly points to an ultimate good or deliverance, and consequent happiness; e.g. in § 13, Buddha said, "Who is the good man? The religious or pious man only is good. And what is goodness? First and foremost, it is the agreement of the will with the conscience, or reason. Who is the great man? He who is strongest in the exercise of patience; he who patiently endures wrong and leads a blameless life; he is a man indeed. And who is the truly enlightened? A man wholly freed from the power of sin, possessed of perfect knowledge, sees and hears all things; such a man is, indeed, possessed of the highest good." And such a man, Buddha teaches, has obtained already eternal rest—to use his own phrase, has tasted the "sweet dew" that is the Nectar of immortality. An immortality, however, independent of the trammels of individual existence, but yet real and substantial—the immortality which attaches to the Being of one who having had no birth cannot die.

Again, the Zoroastrian doctrine asserts that there can be no happiness undefined by sorrow—that is, that sorrow is wrapped up with all human sources of happiness, a doctrine fully developed in Buddhism. And in the *Sûtra* before us—e.g. in § 35—Buddha says: "A religious man has his griefs and sorrows like the rest of the world, for from birth till old age, and from this through disease to death, the sorrows to be endured are endless; the world is encompassed with sorrow."

This, too, is the first of the four great truths which lie at the foundation of the system, that sorrow exists, ever increases, but may be escaped by the way of the Master's teaching.

And once more the Evil Principle, or the Evil or Wicked One, Mâra or Pisuna, is common both to the Iranian and the so-called Indian system. We are *all*, like Buddha himself, subject to the temptations or fascinations or bewitchments of this Evil Principle; he is represented as "the Lord of this world," i.e. this *loka*; and what is stranger still, in a curious *Sûtra* well known in China, he is represented as coming to Upagupta, one of the early apostles of Buddhism, as an angel of light, in the shape of Buddha.

¹ And so in § 7 of the *Sûtra* we are considering, Buddha says: "The man who foolishly does me wrong, to him I will return the protection of my ungrudging love." Where in the original the expression ungrudging love points to the four elements of Benevolence, i.e. love, pity, sympathy, and equanimity (or, impartiality).

himself, by which Upagupta was so fascinated that he fell down and worshipped him.

It is also a legend known everywhere that Ananda himself, the bosom companion and attendant of Buddha, was so bewitched by the fascinating influence of this Evil One that he failed to ask his Master to continue in the world for the entire age, and in consequence the Buddha died.

The name of the Iranian Evil Principle, however, is a *thought* or a passion—he is called “the Angry Mind”; and so in the scene of the Great Temptation of Buddha, the three daughters—*i.e.*, the abstract qualities of the Evil Principle—are : Concupiscence, Lust, and Anger ; and the prevailing sentiment in the entire episode is, that Māra represents the thought of unbridled rage. He is the *passion* thought that opposes the *good* thought.

I contend, then, that as we find nothing of all this in the pre-Buddhist literature of India, we must seek its origin elsewhere than in that country ; and, from long study, I feel scarcely any doubt that the great outline of the Buddhist system was brought to India by perhaps the very first settlers in the country ; that it was repressed and hidden under the paramount authority of the first Aryan invasion ; and that after a time there was an upheaval of old beliefs, as the new doctrine was corrupted ; and by the personal influence of the great Master himself, the system he taught superseded the old one, and reigned dominant in India for a thousand years.

It may be as well to point out some broad and general reasons for disconnecting the origin of Buddhism with any supposed development of Indian doctrine in that direction.

In the first place, let us take the worship of relics. In China this is a common superstition, where the *sariras* of Buddha, whether a bone or a hair, are religiously preserved. One of the greatest of the *litterati* in the Tang dynasty was banished for protesting against the worship of a decayed bone. This form of worship is coeval with the rise of Buddhism ; but in Brahmanism, though the word *stūpa* is used, yet there is no mention whatever of relic worship. It is of pre-Aryan origin, and may be traced back to the world-wide custom of tombs erected over the incinerated remains of some famous hero or chieftain in the early, if not earliest, days of the world's history.

Max Müller states that Buddhism starts with a denial of the sacred character of the *Vedas*.—(*India*, p. 180.) Again, Oldenberg has this remark : “ In training of nobles in those lands which were but slightly attached to Brahmanism, more attention was paid to martial exercises than to the *Vedas*. Buddhists have not attributed Vedic knowledge to their Master.”—(*Buddhism*, p. 100.)

Again, the same writer says : “ Vedic culture has not had its home, originally at least, amongst these stocks of the East —*i.e.* the Sakyas and Magadhas.”—(*Ibid.*, p. 411.)

Again, he says the Sakyas and their neighbours were little affected by

Brahmanic influences. In fact the whole of the Magadha territory, where Buddha first taught (although he was born and trained in Kapilavastu), was never wholly Brahmanized, and Buddha did not speak Sanskrit; and he questions whether the Magadhas were Aryans.—*Ibid.*, pp. 400, 403.)

It is true, Oldenberg remarks, that "during Buddha's lifetime there was a union of Teacher and Master, after the Brahmanical model."—(*Ibid.*, p. 237.)

But why *after* the *Brahmanical* model; there were other teachers and disciples besides the Brahmans in India; and the model may be sought far afield; there were Schools of the Prophets in Israel; the Magi had their initiated followers in Persia or Media; the followers of Pythagoras and the early Greek schools might show us a model. In fact, it is an elemental arrangement, resulting from the very nature of the thing, that a teacher must have followers. And we do not wonder then that it was so with the Buddha. Only in his case the disciples were won by the exercise of 'spiritual control, the activity of the Order was spiritual—*i.e.* not so much logical or disputative, as authoritative over the conscience. It was a spiritual activity that now began to work in India, and was transferred to China as a part of the system inaugurated by the Master.

We have a striking example of this spiritual influence in the very first account of Buddha's career. He had gained illumination, and was a supreme Buddha. Oldenberg would tell us he was "a converted man." He had hesitated for a time whether the world was prepared for his doctrine, but, at last, was persuaded by Brahmā Sahampati to go forth and preach. I say *preach*, because he had a message to the conscience, and not to the intellect only. He prepared, therefore, to begin his work. His old friends, who were not necessarily Brahmans, were dead, and so he went to Benares to seek for and convert the five men who had been sent by his Father to watch him and track his steps. These five men had left him, disappointed because, after a six years' fast, the teacher had discovered that right wisdom did not result from extreme asceticism, as it certainly did not from unrestraint. They had left him partly in anger, but more in distrust, and had gone to Benares. He went on his way thither: on the road he met a young Brahman called Upaka; the youth was arrested by the strange appearance of the Master, so self-possessed, so noble in his gait, and unaffected in his deep purpose. There was, as Mrs. Jameson says of the expression of Christ's face, in *his* face a sort of divine sympathy towards the human race; they spoke together, and the young man, overwhelmed with the feeling that he had been in contact with some one greatly superior to himself, hesitated, halted as he went on, looked back, but finally separated himself from the fascination of this strange presence.

The Master went on—came to Benares, and advanced to the Park of Deer, where the five men were practising their religious duties. When they saw him, strong in his purpose, recovered from his exhausting fast,

commanding in his person, they declared they would not move nor greet him as he came. The Master approached still nearer, and then, strange to say—drawn by an irresistible charm, beyond control—the five men rose, saluted him as he advanced, prepared him a seat, bathed his feet, and by the first sermon he preached were converted. This sermon on the four great truths, is well known. "Sorrow and deliverance from Sorrow" is the "*Text*"; the "*Sermon*," how to find deliverance and arrive at rest. And the consequence, as the Chinese version of the *Mahākavya charita* says, was this:—

"The great Lord Buddha now has moved the world.
He turns the religious wheel of perfect purity.
The stormy winds are hushed, the clouds dispersed.
Down fall from space the heavenly flowers.
The angels revel in celestial joys—filled with unutterable gladness."

This idea of angels rejoicing in worldly concerns is entirely non-Indian or un-Brahmanic; it has the ring of other teaching, and of people far removed from any Indian centre.

But I will pass on to observe proofs of the spiritual activity excited in China by the Introduction of Buddhism.

Let us allude to the vast body of Buddhist Literature produced in that country. When the entire copy of the Buddhist Tripitaka in Chinese was sent to this country a few years ago, I was instructed by the Secretary of State for India to catalogue and report upon it.

As it came to us in several huge boxes, I calculated that, if one packet were placed on another in an upright position, the whole pillar of books would be something like one hundred and twenty feet in height.

Now this literature is principally a body of translations—translations from various originals—made by foreign priests or teachers, who were constrained by a desire to propagate their religion to travel to the East. As I have already noticed, the first teachers who came to China arrived there about 73 A.D., and brought with them books, some of which, as they translated them, still survive. Temples were founded for their accommodation, and the Emperor and the court were their patrons.

Following them, in rapid succession, other foreign teachers reached the country: some were Parthians, some were Huns, and some Indians. They all brought books, and went on translating; and the Chinese went on building temples and monasteries, till the whole country was covered with them. There were intervals of persecution and reaction, but there was a spiritual activity abroad, which had scarcely ever been equalled before in the country. Now what was the origin of this? Partly, no doubt, it resulted from an enthusiasm derived from the foreign teachers themselves, but principally from the system.

The secret of the power of the Buddhist doctrine lies in this, that it is an utterly unselfish one; it teaches us from Buddha's example that the greatest good and happiness a man can enjoy is to do good to others. The thought of self is evil. The love of others than ourselves is the end

of religion. Hence the example of Buddha is constantly quoted; e.g. Fa-hien, the Chinese pilgrim to India, tells us he heard the following announcement made by an eloquent man in Ceylon. This man, mounted on a gaudily caparisoned elephant, and clad in royal apparel, spoke thus: "Our Bodhisattva—i.e. Buddha in a previous condition—during endless ages, underwent every kind of austerity for the sake of delivering all flesh. He spared himself no personal suffering, he left his home and country, he gave up wife and children, he tore out his eyes to heal the blind, he cut his flesh to feed the dove, he gave his head in alms, he sacrificed his body to feed a tiger, he grudged neither his marrow nor his brain. Thus he endured every sort of anguish for the good of others. After he became a Buddha he lived in the world forty-nine years to teach and convert men. He gave rest to the wretched; he saved the lost; then he died; the eyes of the world were put out, and all living things were filled with sorrow. After ten days his relics will be brought forth, let all persons come and do them reverence."

Now here lies much of the power of the Buddhist teaching—this idea of unselfish thought for others, and it is this which led to the spiritual activity of which I am speaking, and to the diffusion of the vast literature in which these instances of self-denial are recorded. It was all *strange* to the Chinese, but it commended itself to their consciences.

Take again the profound doctrine embodied in Buddhism, and developed in China. I mean the vast consequences of rightly or wrongly formed *character*. This character is formed by conduct. The Buddhists, we are told, do not acknowledge a human "soul." I think Butler in his works does not use this word; he speaks of a vital principle, but not of the soul. It is difficult to define the word—we might understand the independent existence of *spirit*, but the word "soul" as a living personal identity is difficult to define. Anyhow, it was not understood in the way we understand it by the Buddhists. They spoke of the soul in the eye, in the ear, and in the different organs or entrances of the body. They denied that the sight was, or contained, the soul, or the hearing, or the smelling; whatever was apprehended by the senses, even down to "mind," i.e. the cognitive faculty—all these were unreal, vanishing, and delusive; in this way they denied the existence of any monad like our conception of soul. But they affirmed the re-productive power of *character*, and also what is called salvation by character. Now I maintain that this word "character" and what is called *soul* are identical. I will quote from a little tract before me that some one sent me yesterday morning. It is entitled *The Theology of the Future*, by Dr. James Freeman Clarke. I may say I know nothing of this gentleman, or his publishers; but I am bound to say there is much to recommend his tract. The fourth section is headed "Salvation by Character," and he proceeds to say salvation means the highest peace and joy of which the soul is capable. But here the writer runs counter to the Platonic doctrine, which is taken up by

Rutler : if the soul has a character, it is not a simple entity, simply soul ; it is soul *plus* character, and being compound it cannot be eternal. So that it seems soul and character must be identical and simple. And here I cannot but notice the marked agreement between the teaching of Buddha and Plato on this point of "simple being" : the Buddhists say whatever is compounded is temporary—the word is *Samkhāra*, which Mr. Rhys Davids translates "confection"; exactly the same word is used by Plato when he speaks of compounded things being transitory ; he says they are *σύνθετα* (*Phædo*, cap. 25), which is very much like the Buddhist *Samkhāra*; but, he argues, the soul—where he does not mean the individual soul, but the part of the universal soul, separated for a time but destined to return—is a *simple* essence, and therefore immortal ; so, with the Buddhists, character is immortal—not the same identical character, but the result of conduct in character—good or bad—ever tending to the *ultimate* character of unalloyed and simple goodness ; or, to use other words, the character of God, *besides whom there is none good*.

Now what I want to say is, that there is a power in this thought which must result in activity. We are forming our *character* ; it is in our own hands ; it is a noble work ; we are building up gold, silver, hay, stubble—the fire will try us. Here, I repeat, is the secret of the power of Buddhist doctrine : whether he was right or wrong in details, the Master laid down in *this* (as in the former case of vicarious suffering) a principle that commends itself to the conscience and the untrammelled reason. We are building ourselves up, shaping ourselves—*i.e.* our characters—for the future ; the responsibility is great, but the perfect daylight and the freedom in which we bask, the nobility of thought, the high resolve, the steadfast purpose—all these as active or motive powers are the spurs that urge us on to a virtuous life. I cannot allow myself, although encroaching on your time, to pass by the identity of belief—or *fancy*, if you will—on this point between the Greek and Buddhist definition of this all-potent element. The Buddhist says that *Karma*, which the Chinese translate as "building up" or "structure" (in the sense of *creating*), is the supreme Arbiter. Now Karma simply means the formation of character, which is, in fact, the power that decides our future destiny ; the Greeks have the same word, almost identical in root formation—I mean *κῆρ*, or destiny—and precisely as in the Buddhist stories, which I might read if there were time, the divine Sākra asserts that he can do nothing against the consequences of Karma, so the Greek Zeus confesses he is impotent to resist Fate or *κῆρ*.

The two thoughts are identical ; the idea of Karma, so far from being only Indian, lies embedded in the earliest stratum of human speculation ; and, so far, is worthy of our consideration in tracing the origin of these beliefs.

Thus we may trace the influence of Buddhism in China back to the original conception of reward and punishment.

I suppose this thought lies at the root of popular religion. We need not try to define the character of the reward or punishment, but simply state that there are consequences accruing from the practice of virtue, or the contrary, which must certainly overtake us.

I pass on to observe some facts connected with the cosmogony of the Buddhists, as it has been developed in China. The influence of what is called the Lotus School has resulted in some extremely interesting speculations. The great problem before the world had been to account for the origin of things. You remember, I daresay, the remarkable passage in the tenth book of the *Rig Veda* in which the originator is spoken of as "breathing," "breathless."

The search after this first cause ended in the symbolism of the Lotus, which floats in its loveliness on the surface of the Lake, but comes from an unknown source. So the Lotus was used as the emblem of what we should call creation. Whence come these worlds around us? who is the First? where His abode? The answer was: "We cannot tell; the Lotus floats upon the water—that is all we know."

Now let us trace the active growth of this conception.

The first and earliest idea was, that all things spring from water; hence the world, or the four quarters of the world, are represented as floating on the universal Ocean, placed symmetrically.

In the centre is the Divine Mountain, the Olympus of the Greeks, the Zagros of the Iranians, the Meru of the Indians; around this mountain are the rock girdles which prevent approach by mortal man to the abode of the gods; beyond the outer girdle of rocks, in the salt sea, are the four quarters of the world, denoted by the figures and the accompanying islands.

Here we have the earliest thought of a central inaccessible mountain, and the four quarters, or the four winds, into which the world is divided as it floats on the sea.

At the base of the central mountain are the four guardians, who keep the way and guard the residence of the gods. This idea is also a primitive one, denoted in Homer by the Horæ or Seasons, who keep the gates of Olympus.

On the summit of the Divine Mountain are the abodes of the gods, or the thirty-three gods, over whom Sakra the Powerful One reigns supreme. These are the *Ολυμπια δαματα*; the number thirty-three is known in the *Vedas*, incorporated therein, doubtless, from the old tradition, which may be traced back to the period when Time or Chronos was the supreme ruler, and when the year, the four seasons, and the twenty-eight days made up the thirty-three. Above this Paradise are the three tiers of higher Heavens:—The Kama Heavens, in which there are earthly pleasures; the Rupa Heavens, in which there are forms but no earthly pleasures; and the Arupa Heavens, in which there are neither Forms nor human conceptions. This was the extended idea of the One System of worlds. Buddha

taught in agreement with the oldest beliefs that all the denizens of these worlds are subject to decay and death ; just as Homer makes Nectar a condition of prolonged life to the Gods, without which they would perish ; Buddha, therefore, would have nought to say about such a Heavenly State ; he sought after a condition of Being that never began and never will perish, —an eternal state of existence, and he called this *Nirvāna*, a non-breathing state, like that of Him before His breath went forth upon the Waters.

Before passing on to notice the extension of this system of worlds, I will notice that underneath the earth, the Buddhists, and especially the Chinese Buddhists, place the various prisons in which the wicked are confined for vast, but not endless, periods of time ; they are called earth-prisons, and the sufferings endured in each are supposed to be material. The lowest prison is a burning one, surrounded by an iron wall—it is the Tartarus of Homer (cf. *Iliad*, viii. 15), with its iron gates and brazen walls, the deepest underneath the earth. The lowest place of punishment is called Avichi, which the Chinese translate “without interval” ; there is no cessation of pain here, literally the fire is not quenched, but yet there is hope of escape.

And now, under the persuasion of the infinity of the Universe, the Buddhists began to multiply their systems of worlds in this way : they supposed a repetition of mountains and heavens extending through space, over which, however, there was but one Buddha ; they then supposed these extended systems to be multiplied one over the other, the whole springing from a Lotus, denoting their confessed ignorance of the Originator ; advancing still, they placed this complex system of worlds in the centre, and other similar systems to the number of ten surrounding it. These systems were ruled over by other Buddhas.

Advancing yet, they place ten such chiliocosms, ruled over by different Dhyāni Buddhas ; and finally, in sheer despair, they multiply these systems, each one so inconceivably vast, indefinitely, till they become as numerous as the sands of countless Rivers Ganges.

Now the origin of this cosmogony was doubtless, in the first stages of it, inherited from primitive time. The surrounding streams of ocean, the central mountain and the abode of the Gods—these are fables common to all nations ; but the expansion of the belief or system is doubtless Buddhist, and the introduction of the Lotus peculiarly so. But whether matured in the valley of the Ganges, or on the high lands of Asia abounding with lakes, or even in Egypt, we can hardly say. This much, however, appears likely, that the final stage, where the worlds and systems are made as numerous as the Ganges sands, was reached in the dreamy land of Eastern India, and thence carried to China, where it now finds acceptance, and has led to a similar state of dreamy philosophical speculation.

I must hasten to point out one more feature in the Buddhist development in China. I mean the belief in a Western Paradise, with which is connected the worship of Amitābha and Kwan-yin.

The idea of a place of happy rest in the Western regions of the world is an old and well-known one. The sight of the glorious region of the setting sun, so peaceful, so lovely, so full of quiet hope, may have given birth to the thought. We cannot tell. But at any rate, so early as 149 A.D., a Parthian prince, who would have been probably Vologases III. of Parthia, if he had not become a Buddhist monk, came to China and translated the *Sûtra* of boundless years, *i.e.* of Amitâbha or Amitâyus. This gives us an account of the Western Paradise; it is a place beautiful to behold—its golden streets and lovely tanks, the flowers and birds and palaces, all so exquisite; and the happy people who dwell there, worshipping the eternal and all-glorious Amita. This was the fable that excited the wonder and drew out the active spiritual powers of the Chinese converts. Let me only give one example. It is that of a poor Chinese Pilgrim, whose brief history is given us by I-Tsing. His name was Shang-tih.

The narrative is this :—“*Shang-tih*, a contemplative priest, of Ping-chau. He longed for the joys of the Western Paradise, and, with the view of being born there, he devoted himself to a life of purity and religion (*reciting the name of Buddha*). He vowed to write out the whole of the *Prajña-Sûtra*, occupying 10,000 chapters. Desiring to worship the sacred vestiges, and so by this to secure for himself the greater merit, with a view to a birth in that heaven, he travelled through the nine provinces (*of China*), desiring wherever he went to labour in the conversion of men, and to write the sacred books. Coming to the coast, he embarked in a ship for Kalinga. Thence he proceeded by sea to the Malaya country, and thence wishing to go to Mid-India, he embarked in a merchant-ship for that purpose. Being taken in a storm, the ship began to founder, and the sailors and merchants were all struggling with one another to get aboard a little boat that was near. The captain of the ship being a believer, and anxious to save the priest, called out to him with a loud voice to come aboard the boat; but Shang-tih replied, ‘I will not come; save the other people.’ And so he remained silently absorbed, as if a brief term of life were agreeable to one possessed of the heart of Bôdhi. Having refused all help, he clasped his hands in adoration, and looking towards the west, he repeated the sacred name of Amita, and when the ship went down these were his last words. He was about fifty years of age. He had a follower unknown to me, who also perished with his master, also calling on the name of Amita Buddha.”

We cannot doubt that this idea of the Eternal One was, in the first place, borrowed from the boundless Time of the Zoroastrian belief, and became merged in the idea of Mithras, the glorious light; and so the Amita of the Chinese is both the eternal and the altogether glorious.

The worship of Kwan-yin or Avalokiteshvara, the looking-down God, the personification of Mercy, is equally common in China. This Being is sometimes represented as a female with a child on her knee; at other times as a youth or a God. The Chinese everywhere invoke her aid.

There is a liturgy, as complex as any Western manual of the same sort used for her worship ; and the ritual itself is very imposing.

I presume this idea of Kwan-yin was introduced into China with that of Amita Buddha, and that both were derived from the Persian. The worship of Mithras and Anahita, the pure Goddess of the Waters, was a favourite one in the times of Artaxerxes Mnemon ; and, from his patronage, is said to have extended from East to West. The Buddhists, owing to its popularity, incorporated it in their system ; and in China, now, the invocation of Amita and aspirations for mercy and protection at the hands of Kwan-yin form the staple part of the worship and belief of the majority of the people.

All this has created a spiritual activity, the origin of which must first of all be sought in the fundamental thoughts of the system itself. Its unselfishness, its appeal to the conscience, its vast scope, its future hope, its belief in the mercy of the Merciful One, the glory and eternity of the All-Glorious and Eternal One, and the future rest in Paradise.

These thoughts are not Chinese, they are not Indian. They must be looked for in that neighbourhood where in the early beginning there was a knowledge of truth as it came from the Source of Truth, and which, though dimmed by the accretions of time and perverted by fond inventions, still survived to give some faint light and hope to nations that sat in darkness and under the shadow of Death.

ZOROASTRIANISM.

By L. H. MILLS, D.D.

It has been a matter of sincere regret to me that I have been obliged to let two years pass by without contributing anything to this important series of lectures.

The reason has been an "embarrassment of wealth" in the acquisition of manuscripts from the East. It will be understood that it consumes much time to go over manuscripts of the Zend Avesta not merely for the purpose of reading them, but to note down every important or trivial variation in each from the text of its fellows, and this occupation has not only robbed me of the pleasure of contributing to this series, but also delayed the appearance of my recently published Commentary on the Gâthas. Everything has to be stopped for the collation of MSS., as no progress can be made till full light has been obtained upon our texts. And even now I can only jot down items or heads for a future lecture.

The Avesta, like the Bible, the Rig Veda, and other very ancient books, is a collection of documents of widely different ages. The Gâthas, the Haptanghâiti, the other parts of the Yasna, the Vendîdâd and the Yashts, the Afrîdnagân, etc., were composed at different periods. But all stand differentiated from the Gâthas, which are totally distinct in character from the rest of the Avesta, and from the Veda. They are original, the plain expression of actual personal longings, fears, hopes, and struggles; and there is no nature-worship in them, but, on the contrary, the worship of the Creator of nature.

Zoroaster (Zarathushtra) makes no intentional historical statements. If he did, we should doubt them; but he gives us what is far surer than any assertions, and that is, the expression of emotions and efforts which reveal his individuality. The persons mentioned in the Gâthas are plainly actual contemporaneous men engaged in a dangerous politico-religious struggle. All is real, and for that reason of inestimable value. A few hundred years later Zoroaster is a demi-god, and all the rich nature-worship of the Rig Veda appears or reappears. We have, therefore, two stages of the Zoroastrian religion which are as distinct as Quakerism is from Ultramontane Roman Catholicism. As many different religions are included in Christianity, so there are many in Zoroastrianism, and they should be carefully distinguished. To mix up the purity of the Gâthas with the puerile ceremonial of the Vendîdâd mars the effect of each. And unless writers write with careful criticism, the subject of Zoroastrianism will be spoiled.

We cannot determine the age of the Gâthas any closer than we can that of the Iliad, nor so closely, but this should not disturb us. Even my distinguished colleague, Professor Darmesteter, and myself hold to somewhat differing ages. He is inclined to put them as late as 800 B.C., while I am disposed to agree with Professor Roth of Tübingen in placing them beside the early Vedic hymns, say about 1200 to 1500 B.C.; but it is utterly impossible to be certain, and to affect certainty in such a case is simply to impose upon the uninformed.

The one essential point is to distinguish the Gâthas from the remaining parts of the Avesta after we have become sure that they have an undefined antiquity which is quite remote.

While the mass of mankind were worshipping imaginary beings like the wife-beating Jove, for instance, Zoroaster worshipped the purest and most philosophical conception of the Deity that the world had ever seen. His name was "the Wise One," or "the Great Creator." We are uncertain which; but a name is of little moment, and it means one or the other of the above. He has six attributes: "the Good Mind," which we may call "Love" (recall "God is Love"). The Righteous Order, which seems to be his plan of grace, the idea being given by the sacred order of the ritual, but in the Gâtha this attribute is clearly a regulation for grace, so that the human being who becomes filled with Asha is holy in thought, word, and deed, not only exact in ritual, but high in the moral virtues. Then Khshathra is the Divine power, giving efficacy to both the "Love" and the "Grace." Then Aramaiti, literally "the ready mind," "practical piety," is an attribute of the Deity chiefly because He inspires the saints with it. It seems to represent the actual effect of the Love, Grace, and Power of God on the mind of the believer in his obedience and faith; that is, it represents a receptivity. The last two attributes are still more concrete, for they are God's gifts as a reward. Haurvatat, health of mind and body, that is, weal or happiness, and then the perpetuation of this in a deathless life, immortality begun by a long life on earth, but perpetuated in the heaven of good thoughts, words, and deeds.

But there was one great difference between this theology and all others. Very many religions had and have plenty of devils to account for the ill of life; but Zoroastrianism alone at that time, so far as we are aware, actually formulated the idea that there was one original evil spirit. That is to say, it held that "death and all our woe" were inherent in the nature of things. In the later Avesta, Angra Mainyu became the prototype of our Scriptural Satan, and largely assisted in conveying to us the descriptions which we have in the Old and the New Testaments; but in the earlier Avesta, the Gâthas, he is one of "the two original spirits who came together to create life and life's absence."

In other words, we have what seems an actual theological dualism. Two spirits—one a God creating all that is good, and the other an evil Being creating all evil. This can only be accounted for on the supposition that

the authors of the conception found the problem of the origin of evil too formidable to be settled by the supposition that there are a multitude of subordinate evil powers who superficially disturb our happiness. Those early philosophic minds reached a conclusion very similar to that reached by some modern doctrinaires, viz. that God Himself could not have obviated the troubles that befall us; that there could be no good without them, and, strange to say, this remotely ancient conception seems to have given the hint which developed the philosophy of contrast, as I would call it.

The thirtieth chapter of the Yasna suggested the dualism of the Gnostics, as illustrated by light and darkness, and this appeared again in Jakob Boehme, till Schelling, Fichte, and Hegel took up the idea, the latter vehemently declaring that the contrasted elements seen in everything were each one essential to their opposite, so as to make part of it. Sorrow is therefore, according to these writers, absolutely essential to the phenomena of happiness to define them by limitation. There can be no actual apprehension of any advantageous elements in our experience without the co-ordinate apprehension of misery; and this great doctrine (which should contain excessive comfort for all of us) had its initiative in the remotely ancient Gâtha.¹ But I must curtail. I will only add that the ancient Avesta is the richest book of antiquity in the suggestion of deep and religious thoughts. Every chapter of the Gâthas requires chapters of exposition; and if life and strength are spared, I hope to make them the texts for more practical exposition. The 700 pages which I have published on the Avesta, and the 1,000 which I have written on it are not at all sufficient to say all that can be said. I hurriedly sum up points. God, in the Gâthas, is the Creator of all the holier elements of the creation, and of all things save the element of moral and physical evil. The pious Zoroastrian, after a life of honourable toil, goes to an immortality of blessedness in thought, word, and deed. His Heaven is holiness itself, that is, chiefly so. If not pious, he falls to Hell in passing over the Judge's bridge, which leads from Mount Alborj to Heaven, and this Hell consists of evil thoughts, words, and deeds, as well as of physical torment. His body rises (in the later Avesta), and he dwells on a rejuvenated earth. As the agent in this restoration, a Saviour is to arise. He is to be born of the seed of Zoroaster, and of a Virgin who conceives in a lake impregnated with his semen (later Avesta). The Jews came into contact with the Persian religion as we see from the Bible and its extravagant expressions with reference to Cyrus, the Lord's "anointed." That the Zoroastrian religion influenced the Jewish, goes without saying. The entire orthodox Pharisaism, together with its name, might be considered one mass of Zoroastrianism; for when Persian kings are so prominently mentioned in the Bible, the best explanation for the word Pharisee is the word Farsi,

¹ These remarks are not made at haphazard, as I have studied the Kantian philosophy with its predecessors and followers laboriously. See the Introduction to my Commentary, page 21.

which is but another sound for Parsi ; but I will say no more. I close my hour's work by once more insisting on the clear distinction between the different books of the Avesta, above all, between the Gâthas and the rest ; for while the earlier Avesta is one of the sublimest works which have survived to us, the later Avesta contains some of the most ridiculous puerilities, and the later Zoroastrianism, outside both the Old and the New Avesta, has about as much relative authority as the "lives of the Catholic saints."

If we wish to learn the truth about the Avesta, we should listen to no one who is not competent to separate Zoroastrianism into its parts.

THE PARSI RELIGION

BY DADABHAI NAOROJI.

I do not wish in this paper to enter upon controversial religious matters, but rather to place before the British public a picture of the present actual religious life of the Parsis, so that an idea may be obtained of that religious life and of its development.

It is generally believed that their prophet, Zoroaster, flourished some four thousand years ago ; but that belief was much disputed, and I prefer to treat of matters less open to doubt. During the Greek rule, after the conquest of Persia by Alexander, the national religion did not occupy its predominant position, but when the Persian dynasty was re-established by Ardeshir Babezan, a great council of the learned priests was called and the religion was re-established and proclaimed as the national religion.

When the ancient rule of the Persian in his own land was at length overthrown by the Mahommadan, the nation as a whole became gradually Mahommadan. But a few of the Parsis emigrated to India, where they were allowed to land only on condition, as tradition goes, of laying down their arms, changing their kind of dress, and abstaining from killing the cow. Here, mingling with a different race of people, with a different religion, they forgot their own language, very nearly losing at the same time the knowledge of their old religious books. But one thing they did carefully. They took good care of the few religious books they had brought with them, and to a large extent the head priests preserved the understanding of them as they were taught from father to son, though without any critical knowledge or any right appreciation of the value of each.

Gradually, by intermarriage and otherwise, they mixed with the Hindus to such an extent that they became almost assimilated with them—"almost as Hindu as the Hindus themselves," making even offerings at the Hindu temples for several objects.

When I was prime minister of Baroda, a Parsi lady appeared before me on some appeal. I should never have considered her a Parsi, had not my attention been expressly called to the fact, she was so completely Hindu in her accent, in her ideas, and dress. The ladies of the house, and the constant and intimate contact with Hindu neighbours, made customary in Parsi houses most of the Hindu ceremonies, which are observed in cases of birth, marriage, etc., and on holidays.

Then came the Mahommadan on the scene, when the Parsis, ever pliable, adopted some Mahommadan customs, and even carried offerings

to the shrines of some famous Mahommadan saints. They now knew little of their original religion ; but two of its teachings they never forgot—viz., that there was only one God, and that man should marry but one wife. It is true they continued to repeat prayers in the old Zend language, but they did not understand one word of them. With the exception of a few priests, no one knew anything of that language, or of the doctrines inculcated in their scriptures. Their lives were largely taken up with their own and Hindu ceremonials, they had a general vague knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the religion, and a clear notion of its morality, so far that it required pure thought, pure word, and pure deed. Such was the condition of the Parsis at the beginning of the present century.

The English rule in India gave the Parsis greater freedom and scope for their energy. They were the first to start vernacular literature and newspapers on the Bombay side—and a considerable impetus to the development of these papers, and at the same time towards giving greater attention to the study of their religion, was afforded by a comparatively trivial controversy about the calendar. A learned priest from Persia found, on his arrival in India, that the Persian and Indian Parsi calendars did not correspond. The Parsis in India had added one month to the year every hundred and twenty years, to make up the solar or leap year. This, said the Persian priest, was wrong, as there was, he alleged, no sanction for it in the ancient religious books. A bitter controversy arose, members of families quarrelled, and finally the community was split up into two sects. Troublesome, as this incident proved, it had good results attending it. For it was the means of rousing among the Parsis a desire to know more of their religion, the result being a greater activity of mind and a great deepening of religious feeling. The development and the firmer establishment of the Press produced their reflex influence in helping rapid progress.

Next came the Christian missionaries, who began to attack the Parsi religion ; and it was then open to attack from the double circumstances of the deterioration of the original pure ancient faith by the later priest-made literature and ceremonial, and of the adoption of Hindu and Mahommadan ceremonies. The Christian Catholic Church, in the suburbs of Bombay, had also come into by no means unfriendly contact with the Parsis, but the missionaries carried on their attack with much vigour, and succeeded in converting two Parsi youths, who were attending their school. This produced great excitement among the Parsis, and they commenced vigorous efforts to check further conversions. Some magazines were started, to defend the Parsi religion and to attack and criticise Christianity. But more than that, they felt and were awakened to the necessity of teaching their children their religion more intelligently than by merely making them learn by heart some of the prayers and parts in the old Zend language, without understanding anything of it. The agitation of the missionaries led to the preparation of a catechism of the Parsi religion, as

it was then believed to be, some extracts from which will be made, in order to give a fair idea of their theology and morals as then understood. The subject of the dialogue is thus described :—

“A few Questions and Answers to acquaint the Children of the Holy Zarthosti Community with the subject of the Mazdashná Religion (*i.e.* of the Worship of God). Dialogue between a Zarthosti Master and Pupil.”

Ques. Whom do we, of the Zarthosti community, believe in?

Ans. We believe in only one God, and do not believe in any besides Him.

Ques. Who is that one God?

Ans. The God who created the heavens, the earth, the angels, the stars, the sun, the moon, the fire, the water, or all the four elements, and all things of the two worlds; that God we believe in—Him we worship, Him we invoke, and Him we adore.

Ques. Do we not believe in any other God?

Ans. Whoever believes in any other God but this is an infidel, and shall suffer the punishment of hell.

Ques. What is the form of our God?

Ans. Our God has neither face nor form, colour nor shape, nor fixed place. There is no other like Him; He is Himself singly such a glory that we cannot praise or describe Him; nor our mind comprehend Him.

Ques. Is there any such thing that God even cannot create?

Ans. Yes; there is one thing, which God Himself even cannot create.

Ques. What that thing is, must be explained to me.

Ans. God is the creator of all things; but if He wish to create another like Himself, He cannot do it. God cannot create another like Himself.

Ques. How many names are there for God?

Ans. It is said there are one thousand and one names; but of these one hundred and one are extant.

Ques. Why are there so many names of God?

Ans. God's names, expressive of His nature, are two—“Yazdan” (omnipotence), and “Páuk” (holy). He is also named “Hormuzd” (the highest of spirits), “Dádár” (the distributor of justice), “Purvurdegár” (provider), “Purvurtar” (protector), by which names we praise Him. There are many other names also, descriptive of His good doings.

Ques. What is our religion?

Ans. Our religion is “Worship of God.”

Ques. Whence did we receive our religion?

Ans. God's true prophet—the true Zarthost (Zoroaster) Asphantamán Anoshirwán—brought the religion for us from God.

Ques. Where should I turn my face when worshipping the holy Hormuzd?

Ans. We should worship the holy, just Hormuzd, with our face towards some of His creations of light, and glory, and brightness.

Ques. Which are those things?

Ans. Such as the sun, the moon, the stars, the fire, water, and other such things of glory. To such things we turn our face, and consider them our “kibleh” (literally, the thing opposite), because God has bestowed upon them a small spark of His pure glory, and they are, therefore, more exalted in the creation, and fit to be our “kibleh” (representing this power and glory).

Ques. What religion prevailed in Persia before the time of Zarthost?

Ans. The kings and the people were worshippers of God, but they had, like the Hindus, images of the planets and idols in their temples.

Ques. What commands has God sent us through his prophet, the exalted Zarthost?

Ans. Many are those commands, but I give you the principal, which must always be remembered, and by which we must guide ourselves :—

To know God as one; to know the prophet, the exalted Zarthost, as His true prophet; to believe the religion, and the Avesta brought by him, as true beyond all manner of doubt; to believe in the goodness of God; not to disobey any of the commands of the Mazdashná religion; to avoid evil deeds; to exert for good deeds; to pray five times in the day; to believe in the reckoning and justice on the fourth morning after death; to hope for heaven and to fear hell; to consider doubtless the day of general destruction and purification (of all suffering souls); to remember always that God has done what

He willed, and shall do what He wills ; to face some luminous object while worshipping God.

Ques. If we commit any sin, will our prophet save us ?

Ans. Never commit any sin, under that faith, because our prophet, our guide to the right path, has distinctly commanded "you shall receive according to what you do." Your deeds will determine your return in the other world. If you do virtuous and pious actions, your reward shall be heaven. If you sin and do wicked things, you shall be punished in hell. There is none save God that could save you from the consequences of your sins. If any one commit a sin under the belief that he shall be saved by some body, both the deceiver as well as the deceived shall be damned to the day of "Rastá eKhez" (the day of the end of this world).

Ques. What are those things by which man is blessed and benefited ?

Ans. To do virtuous deeds, to give in charity, to be kind, to be humble, to speak sweet words, to wish good to others, to have a clear heart, to acquire learning, to speak the truth, to suppress anger, to be patient and contented, to be friendly, to feel shame, to pay due respect to the old and young, to be pious, to respect our parents and teachers. All these are the friends of the good men and enemies of the bad men.

Ques. What are those things by which man is lost and degraded ?

Ans. To tell untruths, to steal, to gamble, to look with wicked eye upon a woman, to commit treachery, to abuse, to be angry, to wish ill to another, to be proud, to mock, to be idle, to slander, to be avaricious, to be disrespectful, to be shameless, to be hot-tempered, to take what is another's property, to be revengeful, unclean, obstinate, envious, to do harm to any man, to be superstitious, and do any other wicked and iniquitous action. These are all the friends of the wicked, and the enemies of the virtuous.

Such was the first effort made by the Parsis to give religious education to their children.

The old sacred books had also been translated before this time into the vernacular Gujarati language. But the translation was purely literal and baldly mechanical, carried out without any critical intelligence, and with a very unintelligible result. Now came a new force into play. In 1849, I, with other young men, full of enthusiasm and fresh from college, established girls' schools, under the auspices of the "Students' Literary and Scientific Society." Full of enthusiasm, but with empty pockets, we had first to begin this work as volunteer teachers during morning and evening hours, having to contend not a little against the opposition of the majority of the people. But we persevered, and fortunately four gentlemen of the richer class, of advanced views, came to our aid, and the schools acquired a firm footing and became regular day schools.

About the same time we also established "The Dniánprasarak Mandlis" (Societies for the Diffusion of Knowledge), as branches of "The Students' Society." These branches, by their lectures and essays in the vernacular, helped the general advance in social and educational matters, both among Hindus and Parsis.

Another advance was the further extension of journalistic activity. In 1851 I started a weekly paper—"The Rast Gostar," which I think and hope gave a higher tone and increased usefulness to journalism among the Parsis.

In 1851 was started a society, of which I was chosen the first secretary, called the "Rahanumai Mazdiashná" (Guide to the Worshippers of one God). The object of this society was, first, to do away with the Hindu and Mahommadan ceremonies which had become incorporated with their

religious life ; and, next, to make a thorough, critical investigation of the original ancient faith, and to clear it of all the grosser growths of subsequent times. This society had to encounter no little opposition. An antagonistic society was formed, but it soon broke down before the force of truth and intelligence. But the still more difficult opposition it had to encounter, with reference to the abolition of the extraneous Hindu and Mahommadan ceremonies, was from the mothers, wives, and sisters,—the home rulers of the family. Where the men failed the girls' schools succeeded, as was only to be expected. In these schools the girls learned that such and such things were simply prejudice or superstition. They raised the rebellion, in their own innocent and childlike emphatic ways, against this or that custom. "No, ma," shrugging their little shoulders, said they, "this is not our religion, this is not right, this is superstition, etc. ; no, ma, I won't do this." The mother listened to the dear little child when she did not listen to the husband or brother.

Near two generations have arisen since then. The children have grown up, and are now mothers themselves. They are completing the reforms which we young enthusiasts inaugurated, and for a time had been baffled in.

About the time when these movements were going on, in 1852 or 1853, another step was taken in the social reform among the Parsis in the position of woman.

Woman was always held in great honour among the Parsis ; and the only difference between the status of man and woman then was that the latter was not allowed to freely associate with men at the social table of other men or in public assemblies. The Parsis accorded woman an honourable place in society, and placed her on an equality with man. Some of the Parsi heads of families—myself included—arranged to meet together socially with all the members of their families with them, to dine together at the same table and freely converse with each other. The result, after some strong opposition, was the removal of this female disability. One of the reasons why this reform took place was that the teaching of Zoroaster were distinctly in favour of the equality of man and woman. In the words of Zoroaster himself :—"O ye brides and bridegrooms, husbands and wives, I say to you these words : Live with one mind ; do together all your religious duties with purity of thought ; live towards each other with truth, and by these [things] with certainty you shall be happy." This was uttered perhaps four thousand years ago. Throughout the religious books, man and woman have been spoken of as humanly and spiritually equal.

Sir John Malcolm says :—

"There is every reason to believe that the manners of the ancient inhabitants of Persia were softened and in some degree refined by a spirit of chivalry which pervaded throughout the country, from the commencement to the end of the Kayanian dynasty. The great respect in which the female sex was held was no doubt the principal cause of the progress they had made in civilization ; these were at once the cause of generous enterprise and its reward. It would appear that in former days the women of Persia had as

assigned and an honourable place in society, and we must conclude that an equal rank with the male creation which is secured to them by the ordinance of Zoroaster existed long before the time of that reformer."

Though the Parsis have been living for centuries among Mahommadans and Hindus, they did not take to the institution of polygamy. For some time it was a question whether Parsis' social relations were to be judged by the Hindu or English law, as there was no recognised Parsi law for them, with this exception, that the *Panchdyat* (a Council of the Elders) controlled and decided social questions. As education advanced, and the old views and control of the elders began to be opposed, some persons took advantage to indulge themselves in marrying second wives, casting aside the first ones. The whole community—old and young—rose against this, to them, abominable innovation. An association was at once formed, a law was drafted, and the Legislature (the Viceroy's Legislative Council), after several inquiries by a Commission and otherwise, passed a law making polygamy among the Parsis as penal as among Englishmen. I myself asked Professor Spiegel to point out any texts in the religious literature of the Parsis for or against polygamy. He replied: "As far as my knowledge goes there is no instance of polygamy in the religious literature of the Parsis. It is said that Zerdusht had three wives, but he had them successively. I share with you the conviction that the majority of the Parsis were at all times monogamists; although perhaps indulgences have been granted to kings and other individuals of high station." On further inquiry, he says that there is not a single text of the *Avesta* or the later *Parsis* which alluded to polygamy, and that the indulgences he referred to were upon Greek and Latin authority.

This association was also naturally drawn to the question of the custom of early infant betrothals, taken from the Hindus. The older Conservative party were unwilling for several reasons to give way; and a sort of compromise was come to between the Conservatives and the young Reformers, so as to leave the question so open as to die a natural and gradual death, with the advance of education. Now very few such marriages take place, and the practice is fast dying away. What was forty years ago general is now rare and exceptional, especially in Bombay. The law is so framed and left open, that the first case of repudiation coming before law, at the time of the arrival at the proper age, will give the last legal deathblow to this custom of infant betrothals. Reverting to the religious beliefs and morals of the Parsis of that time, I will give a few extracts from the vernacular translation of one of the books, so far as to give a fair idea of the belief as it was then entertained, while the extraneous ceremonies were dying off under the efforts of the Rahanumai.

I now arrange some of these extracts under different heads, as inferences derived from them. To avoid repetition, I shall not, under each head, give all the texts corroborative of it.

The Parsis believe in only one God, the creator of all.

"1st Hâ.—The great judge Hormuzd, of glory and brightness, the highest, the all-

virtuous, the greatest, strictest, the all-wise, of the purest nature, the holiest, lover of gladness—invisible to the visible, the increaser—He created our soul—He moulded our body—He gave us existence. Há 35.—I worship thee, O Hormuzd, above all others, I invoke thee above all others. Há 36.—All virtuous thoughts, all virtuous words, and all virtuous works flow from thee. O Hormuzd, I invoke thy pure nature above all others. Há 40.—By my deeds may I exalt and honour thy name. Under the protection of thy great wisdom have I acquired wisdom. May I reach thee. May I always be firm in thy friendship and in holy deeds."

In Há 44 several extracts relate to this subject, especially God as the creator of all, ending in "Thou art the Creator of all Creation."

In a prayer to Hormuzd (Hormuzd Yasht) occurs this—"My name is the Creator of all."

Zurthost worships God not only in this world, but in the heavens also.—Há 34, "O Hormuzd, I worship thee, and in the heavens, also, shall I worship thee much."

The Parsis believe in the existence of angels, created by God, with powers to aid and benefit mankind in various ways, and to be the superintending spirits of the various parts of creation. The chief among these are the angels of good conscience (Bahaman) and of high piety (Ardehesht); the former is also the protecting angel of the harmless animals, and the latter the angel of fire.

"1st Há.—I invoke good conscience, high piety, love of excellence, high and perfect thought, Khordad and Amardad; all other angels that reach us; the angel 'Meher,' the lord and guardian of the forest, of thousand ears and ten thousand eyes of gladness and of comfort."

"Many other extracts can be made to deduce the above inference.

The various parts of creation are praised, or remembered, or considered holy, etc.

The first seven Háas contain many texts illustrative of this.

"The fire created by God, the time of day, the early dawn, the waters created by God, the year that is spent in holiness, the moon and the glorious sun, the ocean of light, the stars, the immeasurable light, the mountains and the trees, the forest, the sheep, and the harmless animals"; in short, Nature, in her various parts and phenomena, is sometimes praised, sometimes remembered, sometimes described as holy.

As far as I have seen, there is no text in which any lifeless material object without intelligence or spirituality is invoked for assistance or benefit. Such prayers are always directed to intelligent spirits or angels, and to God above all and as the Creator and Lord of all.

The Parsi believes in the immortality of the soul, and in rewards and punishments after death.

"Há 7.—O great and wise Lord, the reward that is due to the religious, may I and mine receive; that reward mayst thou give from thy stores of bounty in such a way, in this and the spiritual world, that I may be exalted, and may I live for ever and ever under thy all-holy leadership, and all-virtuous protection.

"Há 8.—May the aspirations of the holy be fulfilled, may the wicked and evil-doers be disappointed, and be swept away from the creation of the holy Creator. The righteous are immortal."

Extracts from Há 31 bear on this point.

Notwithstanding the abhorrence of evil and evil-doers, the Parsi is made to wish that the wicked may be converted to virtue.

"Há 33.—The wicked are punished according to their thoughts, and words, and deeds. Better it be that they be introduced to a taste of learning. O Hormuzd, give them a desire for wisdom, that they may become promoters of holiness.

"Há 44.—O Hormuzd, why may not these sinners become virtuous?"

The Parsi rests his pardon on the mercy of God, and his reward on the bounty of God.

"Há 1.—If I have by thought, word, or deed, intentionally or unintentionally, not kept thy commands, and thereby saddened thee, I invoke thee in this invocation, I pray to thee and praise thee, and beseech thee for thy pardon.

"Há 7.—May I receive the reward for piety through your bounty."

The morality of this religion is comprised in the three words, pure-thought, pure-word, and pure-deed; and holiness, virtue, prayers, etc., are praised and exalted, and inculcated in many places.

"Há 7.—I praise the virtuous, the good, and the prayerful.

"Há 19.—The high priest is he who is learned in the religion, and whose whole life is devoted to the promotion of righteousness in the world.

"Há 20.—Whoever tastes the pleasure of righteousness, which is above all other pleasures, and walks in righteousness, shall be perfectly holy. He is virtuous who walks in virtue among holy men, and is true to them.

"Há 28.—O Hormuzd, may I reach thee through good thought (conscience). Give me virtue in the creation of this world, and in the other heavenly world. Thou givest Paradise to every man's soul, through good thought (conscience). Whatever thou hast created is with good purposes. May I learn the desire for righteousness, as I am able.

"Há 31.—He who is holy goes to immortality.

"Há 34.—What, O Hormuzd, is thy will, what thy worship, and what thy invocation? God replies—see and adorn holiness—learn my ways of holiness with a good conscience. —Tell me, O Hormuzd, the ways of good conscience.—To be glad with the religion of the good, with virtuous deeds, and with holiness.

"Há 56.—May the virtue of the virtuous endure, and may wickedness vanish. In this house, may obedience prevail over disobedience, peace over quarrel, charity over hard-heartedness, good thoughts over bad thoughts, truth over words of lie, and piety over sin.

"Há 59.—I enjoin on earth and in heaven to study the 'Honwar.' I enjoin holiness on earth and in heaven. That to pray much to Hormuzd is good, I enjoin in heaven and on earth. I enjoin the holy, and the virtuous, and the prayerful, on earth and in heaven to punish the evil spirit and his works, which are wicked and full of death—to punish the thief and the tyrant—punish the magicians of cruel intentions—to punish the breakers of promise, and those that induce others to break their promise—to punish the harassers of good and holy men—to punish the evil thoughts, words, and deeds, of the sinful."

Truth is particularly inculcated.

"Há 7.—I understand truth-telling exalted.

"Há 19.—All the days of the holy man are with thoughts of truth, words of truth, and deeds of truth.

"Há 29.—The walker in truth is the obtainer of immortality, is not to perish.

"Há 31.—To speak true words is true excellence."

The Parsi believes in the necessity and efficacy of prayer.

"Há 56.—I invoke the benefit and success of prayer. To arrive at prayer is to arrive at perfect conscience; the good seed of prayer is virtuous conscience, virtuous words, and virtuous deeds. May our prayers be efficacious in thwarting the inflictions of the wicked spirits and wicked men. May I love prayer, O Hormuzd, for prayer is joy to me. I resort to prayer, and I invoke prayer. Prayer to thee, O Hormuzd, is the giver, excellence, holiness, success, and high exaltation; it is the act of virtue.

"Há 59.—To pray much to Hormuzd is good, I enjoin in heaven and on earth."

The study of the religion is considered most meritorious; and the holy word (the Zend Avesta) is said to have been created by God before all creation. Extracts from Há 19 all refer to this subject.

"Há 44.—What is the high religion? That which promotes holiness and truth with good thought, word, and deed."

Há 19 declares "Honwar" (the word of God) to have been created before the heavens, before the waters, before all creation; and that whoever studies them without wearying shall attain to the paradise of the holy, which is full of glory.

"Há 59.—I enjoin on earth and in heaven to study the Honwar."

The Parsi religion is for all, and not for any particular nation or people.

"Há 46.—May all men and women of the world become my followers, and become acquainted with thy exalted religion. Whoever accepts Zurthost's religion, praises it, and meditates on it, and studies it much, to him God gives a place in the other world; and in this world Bahaman (good conscience) gives him exaltation."

The Parsi religion contains no propitiating of the devil. There is not a single reference to the thoughts, or words, or deeds of evil spirits, without wishing destruction or reformation to them.

"Há 1.—I learn the Zurthost's religion, the worship of God, which is different to that of the Devs (the evil spirits), and is like the justice of God.

"Há 8.—May the wicked and the evil-doers be disappointed, and be swept away from the creation of the holy Creator.

"Há 12.—I am of the religion of the worship of God; I praise that religion and declare it before the wicked, and praise it with good conscience, and virtuous words, and virtuous deeds.

"Há 44.—O Hormuzd, why may not these sinners become virtuous?

"Há 32.—The sinners who desire bribery, and court sovereignty and power with lies, and think wickedness, they are the injurers of the world. They obtain, O Hormuzd, lamentation from their desire.

"Há 33.—The wicked are punished according to their thoughts, words, and deeds. Better it be that they be introduced to a taste of learning. O Hormuzd, give them a desire for wisdom, that they may become promoters of holiness."

The Parsis are called by others "Fire Worshipers," and they defend themselves by saying that they do not worship the fire, but regard it and other great natural phenomena and objects as emblems of the Divine power. To me it appears that the imputation, on the one hand, is wrong, and the defence, on the other hand, a little overshot. Though the Parsi "remembers, praises, loves, or regards holy," whatever is beautiful, or wonderful, or harmless, or useful in nature, he never asks from an unintelligent material object assistance or benefit; he is, therefore, no idolater, or worshipper of matter. On the other hand, when the Parsi addresses his prayers to Hormuzd or God, he never thinks it at all necessary that he should turn his face to any particular object. He would say, and does say, his "Hormuzd yasht" (prayer to Hormuzd) anywhere whatever without the slightest misgiving. Again, when he addresses the angel of water, or any other but that of fire, he does not stand before the fire. It is only when he addresses the angel of fire that he turns his face to the fire. In short, in addressing any particular angel, he turns his face to the object of that angel's guardianship as his emblem. But in his prayers to Hormuzd, he recognises, or uses, or turns his face to no emblems whatever. Since fire only could be brought within the limits of the temple—any of the grand objects of nature (as the sea, the sun, etc.) being unavailable for this purpose—the temples naturally became the sanctuaries of fire alone, and hence has arisen the mistake of the Parsis being regarded as "Fire Worshipers."

'This much is clear in Há 30—"He who knows God through His works reaches Him";—but I do not recollect meeting with any text enjoining a Parsi to turn his face to any particular object as an emblem of God; though he is directed, as in the above text, to rise from Nature to Nature's God.

The doctrine of any sort or form of "propitiation of the devil" does not find place in their books. To struggle for doing good and destroying evil is an emphatic injunction.

Such was the state of the religious belief of the Parsis till a generation ago. But the study of the Zend Avestá has been since carried on with increasing zeal, activity, and intelligence by Parsi educated scholars. The "Ruhanumai," of which I have been president for some years, has been, through the means of such scholars, carrying on its researches in the ancient literature, and from time to time bringing the results before the communities by public meetings and publications of their proceedings. The views now held by such scholars are that some of those religious books, which the Parsis considered canonical, were not so; that with the exception of a certain portion, called the *Gáthas*, they were not the words of Zarthusht or his contemporary disciples and coadjutors,—that before Zarthusht's time the religion was almost a polytheism. Zarthusht made a complete revolution—preached the worship of the one great supreme God, as the beginning and end of the holy religion; and that God alone was the

creator and giver and all-in-all of everything. He threw aside the earlier gods or spirits; addressing God,—“Thou and thou alone does my mind’s eye see.”

The monotheism of Zarthusht was complete and unequivocal; and his monogamy was as clear. The present Parsi scholars maintain that the other books are later compilations by priests; that after the death of Zarthusht the priests rehabilitated, though in subordinate positions, the earlier spirits, which were considered as presiding over fire, water, earth, and all the great creations of nature; and established the ritual and ceremonies as thought desirable or profitable to themselves, as has happened with other religions,—that all the invocations to the various spirits for aid were not a part of the religion as Zarthusht established it; and that the Parsis should return to the original spirituality, simplicity, and purity of their religion,—that it is clear from Zarthusht’s words that the eternal principles of the worship of one God, and of purity in thought, word, and deed were alone binding for ever. But all customs, ritual and ceremonies adopted according to the circumstances of time, place and civilization, can be altered as the good and the physical and spiritual wants of the community may require. These scholars therefore urge that, whatever might have been the justification or reasons of many religious customs and ceremonies at the time when they were first adopted, they were not binding on the community for ever, and that they must reform their customs and ritual as time and circumstances might demand, after careful consideration by the community.

One of the books (*the Vandidad*) which was considered in ignorance, as most sacred, is a compilation of various times, and is mainly directed to the inculcation of cleanliness. It is an elaborate sanitary code, according to the lights, requirements, and influences of the times and conditions of life of the Parsis.

I may conclude by remarking that, though the Parsis are a small number—only about 84,000 in all India, in the midst of a population of 254,000,000—I think one important reason why they occupy so large a space in the mind of the world is that influence of their religion which imposed upon them love of God, love of truth, of charity in all its senses, and an earnest striving after doing some good as the mission of life, and which embraced their morality of life in pure thought, word and deed. May they always continue to follow in these paths!

MITHRAISM.

By JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

IN the current edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the completion of which was recently celebrated, you will find devoted to the subject of the ancient deity Mithra or Mithras, and his cultus, one half-page. It might seem, then, that I am asking your attention to a subject of very small importance—to a religion of very little account among the religions of antiquity. I venture to assert, however, that though I should now fail to awaken in you any interest in the matter proportionate to its moment, Mithraism is and will remain a subject with a very close and serious bearing upon the history of religious evolution, and upon the concrete religion prevailing in our own day in Christendom. A very little inquiry serves to discover that this ancient cult, of which so little is known in our own time, was during some centuries of the Roman Empire the most widespread of the religious systems which that Empire embraced; that is to say, that Mithraism was the most nearly universal religion of the western world in those early centuries which we commonly call Christian—the two or three centuries before the fall of Imperial Rome. As to this, students seem agreed.¹ To the early Fathers, we shall see, Mithraism was a most serious thorn in the flesh; and the monumental remains of the Roman period, in almost all parts of the empire, show its extraordinary popularity. In our own country, held by the Romans for three hundred years at a time when Christianity is supposed to have penetrated the whole imperial world, there have been found no monumental signs whatever of any Roman profession of the Christian faith; while monuments in honour of Mithra abound.² There has been found, for instance, a Mithraic cave at Housesteads, in Northumberland, containing sculptures of Mithra-worship, and an inscription: "To the god, best and greatest, invincible Mithra, lord of ages"; and another at Kichester, with an inscription: "To the god the sun, the invincible Mithra, the lord of ages." Other monuments have been found at Chester, on the line of the

¹ Cf. Tiele, *Outlines of the Hist. of the Anc. Relig.*, Eng. trans., p. 170; Gaston Boissier, *La Religion Romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, i. 395, ii. 417; H. Seel, *Die Mithraegeheimnisse*, Aarau, 1823, p. 214; Sainte-Croix, *Recherches sur les Mystères du Paganisme*, 2e ed., ii. 123; Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*, Art *Paganism*; Beugnot, *Hist. de la Destruction du Paganisme*, 1835, i. 152-161; ii. 225; Windischmann, *Mithra, ein Beitrag zur Mythengeschichte des Orientis*, in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlands*, Bd. i., S. 62.

² See Wright's "The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon," 4th ed., pp. 327, 353.

Roman wall, at Cambeck-fort in Cumberland, at Oxford, and at York.¹ And "Mithraic bas-reliefs, cut upon the smoothed faces of rocks, or upon tablets of stone, still abound throughout the former western provinces of the Roman Empire; many exist in Germany; still more in France."² According to Mr. King, again, "the famous 'Arthur's Oon' (destroyed in the last century) upon the Carron, a hemispherical vaulted building of immense blocks of stone, was unmistakably a *Specus Mithraeum*, the same in design as Chosroes' magnificent fire-temple at Gazaca."³

And yet, with all this testimony to the vogue of Mithraism in the early Christian centuries, there ensues for a whole era an absolute blank in the knowledge of the matter in Christendom—a thousand years in which the ancient cultus seems a forgotten name in Europe. One modern investigator, M. Lajard,⁴ thinks that since the time of the Fathers, as the phrase goes, the first in European literature to mention Mithra was Pietro Riccio (Petrus Crinitus),⁵ born about 1465, a disciple of Politian; and no other mention occurs till about the middle of the sixteenth century.⁶ And such was the ignorance of most scholars, that of three now well-known Mithraic monuments discovered about that period, not one is attributed to Mithra either by the great antiquarian of the time, Rossi, or by his pupil Flaminio Vacca. You all know the sculptured group of Mithra slaying the bull, so often engraved, of which we have a good example in the British Museum. Rossi declared one of these monuments to represent Jupiter, as the bull, carrying off Europa; and Vacca tells how a lion-headed image, now known to represent Mithra, but then held to represent the devil, was (probably) burned in a limekiln. A century later, Leibnitz demonstrated that Ormazd and Ahriman were simply deified heroes; and later still the historian Mosheim, a man not devoid of judgment, elaborately and fatuously proved that Mithra had simply been at one time, like Nimrod, a famous hunter,⁷ before the lord or otherwise. And even in our own day, when all the extant notices and monuments of Mithra have been carefully collected and studied, a vigilant scholar⁸ confesses that we are profoundly ignorant as to the Mithraic religion. It is somewhat remarkable that this should be so: and though in the terms of the case we cannot look to find much direct knowledge, we may hope at least to find out *why* the once popular cultus has fallen into such obscurity. To that end we must see what really is known about it.

¹ *Id.* p. 327. Wellbeloved, *Eboracum*, 1842, pp. 75, 84. Stukeley, *Palaographica Britannica*, No. 3, London, 1752. See also the inscriptions to Sol and Mithra in Hübner, *Inscr. Brit. Lat.*

² C. W. King, "The Gnostics and their Remains," 2nd ed., p. 136: See the modern writers on Mithraism generally.

³ *Id.* *ib.*

⁴ *Introduction à l'Étude du Culte de Mithra*, 1846, pp. 2, 3.

⁵ *De Honestas Disciplina*, v. 14, cited by Lajard.

⁶ By Smet and Pighi.

⁷ Mosheim's notes on Cudworth, *Intel. Syst.*, Harrison's ed., i. 473.

⁸ Havet, *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, iii. 402.

If we were to trace completely the history of Mithraism, however, we should have to make an examination not merely of Mithraism proper, but of at least three older systems.¹ One principle must have been impressed on many of you by the present course of lectures—namely, that all religions run into and derive from some other religions, the creeds of all mankind being simply phases of a continuous evolution. So, when we say that Mithraism derives from Persia, we are already implying that it affiliates more distinctly to India and to Assyria—to the earliest of those masses of confused fancies which represent in somewhat collected form man's endless guesses at the riddle of the universe. Here it must suffice, therefore, to give only the briefest sketch of origins.

We trace the cult specifically in the earliest Aryan documents—in the Vedas, in which the deity Mithra is one of the most prominent figures.

"In the Indo-Iranian religion," M. Darmesteter writes,² "the Asura of Heaven was often invoked in company with Mithra, the god of the heavenly light; and he let him share with himself the universal sovereignty. In the Veda they are invoked as a pair (Mitra-Varunā) which enjoys the same powers and rights as Varunā alone, as there is nothing more in Mitra-Varunā than in Varunā alone, Mithra being the light of Heaven, that is, the light of Varunā. But Ahura-Mazda [Ormazd] could no longer bear an equal, and Mithra [in the Zend-Avesta] became one of his creatures; 'This Mithra, the lord of wide pastures, I have created as worthy of sacrifice, as worthy of glorification, as I, Ahura-Mazda, am myself.'³ But old formulae, no longer understood, in which Mithra and Ahura, or rather Mithra-Ahura, are evoked in an indivisible unity, dimly remind one that the Creator was formerly a brother to his creature."

"He preserved, however, a high situation, both in the concrete and in the abstract mythology. As the god of the heavenly light, the lord of vast luminous space, of the wide pastures above, he became later the god of the Sun, *Deo invicto Soli Mithra*; (in Persian, *Mithr* is the Sun.) As light and truth were one and the same thing, viewed with the eyes of the body and of the mind, he becomes the god of truth and faith. He punishes the Mithra-Drug, 'him who lies to Mithra' (or 'who lies to the contract,' since Mithra as a uenter noun means friendship, agreement, contract'); he is a judge in hell, in company with Rashnu, 'the true one, the god of truth, a mere offshoot of Mithra in his moral character.'⁴

The ritual of the Avesta is perfectly clear on the subject. "We sacrifice unto Mithra and Ahura, the two great, imperishable, holy Gods; and unto the stars, and the moon, and the sun, with the trees that yield up baresma" [burned on the altar]. "We sacrifice unto Mithra, the lord of all countries, whom Ahura-Mazda made the most glorious of all the Gods in the world unseen." "So may Mithra and Ahura, the two great Gods, come to us for help. We sacrifice unto the bright, undying, shining, swift-horsed sun."⁵ And connected with the teaching of Zoroaster we find Mithra extolled by Ahura-Mazda as a beneficent and comforting spirit.

¹ As to Accadian connections, see Lenormant, "Chaldean Magic," Eng. trans., pp. 195, 236.

² The Zend-Avesta, I, Introd., pp. lx, lxi, "Sacred Books of the East" series, vol. iv.

³ "Mithr Yast," I., in vol. II. of M. Darmesteter's translation of the Zend-Avesta (vol. 23 of "Sacred Books" series). Cf. the Khôrshed Nyâyis in same vol., p. 351.

⁴ On the bearing of early Mithraism on conduct, see in particular the "Mithr Yast," xxix., pronounced by M. Darmesteter "one of the most important in the Avesta, as a short account of the social constitution and morals of Zoroastrian Iran" (ii. 149, n.).

⁵ Darmesteter's "Zend-Avesta," ii., 158, 351.

"Happy that man, I think,"—said Ahura-Mazda,—“O holy Zarathustra ! for whom a holy priest, . . . who is the word incarnate, offers up a sacrifice unto Mithra. . . . Straight to that man, I think, will Mithra come, to visit his dwelling. Then Mithra's boons will come to him, as he follows God's teaching, and thinks according to God's teaching.”¹ This was doubtless a relatively late and high form of the cultus in Persia, since in the Avesta we find Mithra repeatedly invoked as a warlike and formidable deity, a god of battles, swift to assail and slay the enemies of truth and justice—which would normally mean, the enemies of his worshippers.

Thus, then, we have the cultus of Mithra as the sun-god, the deity of light and truth, created by, and yet co-equal with, the Supreme Deity, and fighting on the side of the good against the evil power Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman),—this at a period long before the Christian era. So much is certain, whatever we may decide as to the actual period of the writing of the Avesta, as it has come down to us. Of the literature of Mazdeism, of course, a great deal has perished ; this appearing, says M. Darmesteter, not only from internal evidence, but from history.

“The Arab conquest proved fatal to the religious literature of the Sassanian ages, a great part of which was either destroyed by the fanaticism of the conquerors and the new converts, or lost during the long exodus of the Parsis. . . . The cause that preserved the Avesta is obvious ; taken as a whole, it does not profess to be a religious encyclopædia, but only a liturgical collection ; and it bears more likeness to a prayer-book than to the Bible.”²

Thus we can only infer the nature of the system. But what we do know is that, as time went on, the cultus of Mithra became more and more considerable. It is hardly accurate to say, as does Canon Rawlinson, that “Mithra was originally not held in very high esteem” ; but it is the historic fact that

“he ultimately came to occupy a place only a little inferior to that assigned, from the first, to the Ahura-Mazda. Darius, the son of Hystaspes, placed the emblems of Ahura-Mazda and of Mithra in equally conspicuous positions on the sculptured tablet above his tomb [B.C. 485] ; and his example was followed by all the later monarchs of his race whose sepulchres are still in existence. Artaxerxes Mnemon [d. B.C. 358] placed an image of Mithra in the temple attached to the royal palace of Suza. He also in his inscriptions unites Mithra with Ahura-Mazda, and prays for their conjoint protection. Artaxerxes Ochus [d. B.C. 337] does the same a little later ; and the practice is also observed in portions of the Zendavesta composed about this period.”³

Artaxerxes Mnemon, too, swore by “the light of Mithras,” as our William the Conqueror swore by “the splendour of God.”⁴

But of the importance and range of the Mithraic worship at a distant

¹ Darmesteter's “Zend-Avesta,” ii. 155.

² *Ibid.*, *Introd.*, pp. xxxi., xxxii.

³ “The Religions of the Ancient World,” p. 105, citing the author's “Ancient Monarchies,” iv. 334 ; Flandin, *Voyage en Perse*, pls. 164 *bis*, 166, 173-6 ; Loftus, “Chaldea and Susiana,” p. 572 ; and Sir H. Rawlinson's “Cuneiform Inscriptions,” i. 342. See also Windischmann, *Mithra, ein Beitrag zur Mythengeschichte des Orients*, in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlands*, Bd. i., S. 55.

⁴ King, “The Gnostics and their Remains,” p. 116 ; Elian, *Var. Hist.*, i. 33 ; Xenophon, *Cryop.* vii. 5, § 53.

period, we have sufficient evidence in the mere vogue of the name Mithridates, "given by Mithra," which we find in use at least six hundred years before the Christian era.

This deity, then, is from remote antiquity one of high moral attributes, at times worshipped, no doubt, licentiously,¹ as deities have been in all ages, but expressly associated with moral qualities. Theologically, he exists both in abstract and in symbol: originally he is simply the sun; later, according to the universal law of religious evolution, he becomes a spirit apart from the sun, but symbolized by it, the sun being worshipped in his name, he being the god who sustains it; nay, an actual subordinate sun-god takes his place, even in the Rig Veda.² But since in Persian his name (Mihr) actually means the sun,³ he can never be dissociated from it; and as the same word also means "the friend," the light being the friend of man,⁴ and seems to connote love or amity, a moral distinction inevitably attaches to him in a stage of human thought in which names have an incalculable significance. And at length, the dualist theory holding its ground as a theological system, as it always will while men personify the energies of the universe, Mithra comes to occupy a singular position as between the two great powers of good and evil, Ormazd and Ahriman (the Ahura-Mazda and Angra-Mainyu of Mazdeism), being actually named the MEDIATOR,⁵ and figuring to the devout eye as a humane and beneficent God, nearer to man than the Great Spirit of Good, a Saviour, a Redeemer, eternally young, son of the Most High, and preserver of mankind from the Evil One. In brief, he is a pagan Christ.

Much has been written as to whether Mithra was worshipped as the sun, or as the creator and sustainer of the sun. There can be little doubt that the two ideas existed, and were often blended. We may depend upon it—that for the weak and ignorant minds, which could only conceive a personal god under the form of a man or animal, or both combined, the perpetual pageant of the sun was a help and not a hindrance to elevation of thought; and that even to the thinkers who sought to distinguish between matter and essence, and reckoned the sun only a part of the material universe, the great orb would yet be the very symbol of life and splendour and immortality, the chosen seat of the deity who ruled mankind; and that, even for them it would be the viewless spirit of the sun who, in their thought, proclaimed to man the oracle of the Soul of the Universe:—

¹ Athenæus (x. 45), citing Ctesias and Duris, tells that among the Persians the king was permitted to get drunk and dance on one day in the year only, the festival of Mithras (probably Christmas-day); no one else being allowed to get drunk or dance on that day.

² Rawlinson, *Relig. of Anc. World*, p. 130.

³ Darmesteter, *Introd. to "Zend-Avesta,"* p. lii.; Sainte-Croix, *Recherches*, ii. 122, *

⁴ Darmesteter, as cited.

⁵ Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris*, 46. As to other mediators, see Spiegel, *Avista*, 1852, *Einführung*, S. 31.

"I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."¹

But in the great polytheistic era, the habit of personifying all the forces of nature led first to a universal admission of the actual existence of the deities of foreign peoples—an admission which we find repeatedly made in the sacred books of the Jews—and later on, to the idea that all the deities of the nations are but names of phases of one central and omnipotent power. Even among the philosophers and theologians, of course, this conception never really destroyed the habit of thinking of the alleged phases or manifestations of *the* deity as being really minor deities; and much more a matter of course was it that among the multitude the deity or deities should always be conceived in a quite concrete form. But the synthesizing tendency early resulted in this, that different cults were combined; different god-names identified as pointing to the same god; and different gods combined into unities of two, three, four, or more members. Egypt is the great theological factory for such combinations; but the law necessarily operated everywhere. The conception of a Divine Trinity is of unknown antiquity; it flourishes in Hindostan, in the Platonic philosophy, in Egypt, long before Christianity. But the combining process, among other variations, had to take account of the worship of goddesses as well as of gods; and in regions where goddess-worship was deeply rooted it was inevitable that there should occur combinations of sex. This actually took place in the worship of Mithra. From Herodotus,² writing in the fifth century B.C., we learn that in some way the god Mithra was identified with a goddess. The whole passage, though familiar to students, is worth quoting:—

"The Persians, according to my own knowledge, observe the following customs. It is not their practice to erect statues, or temples, or altars, but they charge those with folly who do so; because, as I conjecture, they do not think the gods have human forms, as the Greeks do. They are accustomed to ascend the highest parts of the mountains, and offer sacrifice to Jupiter, and they call the whole circle of the heavens by the name of Jupiter. They sacrifice to the sun and moon, to the earth, fire, water, and the winds. To these alone they have sacrificed from the earliest times: but they have since learnt from the Arabians and Assyrians to sacrifice to Venus Urania, whom the Assyrians call Venus Mylitta, the Arabians Alitta, and the Persians Mitra."

This is one of the many seemingly improbable statements in Herodotus which late research has confirmed.³ He is accused, indeed, of blundering⁴ in combining Mithra with Mylitta, it being shown from monuments that the goddess identified with Mithra was Anaitis or Tanat.⁵ I do not see how we can be so sure that Anaitis and Mylitta were never regarded as

¹ A very ancient Pagan formula. Cf. Pausanias. x. 12; and Plato, *Laws*, iv. 7.

² i. 131.

³ Lenormant admits of the alleged blunder: "Perhaps it was not after all an error, and the divine couple . . . may have been sometimes designated as a double Mithra" (*Chaldean Magic*, p. 236).

⁴ Rawlinson's Herodotus, i. 257. Cp. Lenormant, *Manual of Anc. Hist.*, Eng. trans., ii. 46; and *Chaldean Magic*, as quoted.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 416. On the names of this goddess, see G. Diercks, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des Geistes der Menschheit*, Berlin, 1881, i. 242.

the same goddess ; but in any case the point as to combination is certain. It is made good, not only by the statement of the Christian controversialist Julius Firmicus, in the fourth century, and later writers, that the Persians make Mithras both two-sexed and three-fold or three-formed,¹ but by innumerable Mithraic monuments on which appear the symbols of two deities, male and female, the sun and the moon, or, it may be, male and female principles of the sun. And this epicene or double-sexed character is singularly preserved to us in that Mithraic monument of the Græco-Roman period which we possess in our own British Museum, in which the divine slayer of the bull presents a face of perfect and sexless beauty, feminine in its delicate loveliness of feature, masculine in its association with the male form.

But to refer to these Mithraic monuments, of which there are so many examples, is to point out that the old Persian aversion to images of deity had disappeared with the extension of the Mithraic cultus. There is, of course, no doubt as to the original forbiddal of images, despite the common delusion that the Jews were the first to lay down such a veto. The Jews, of course, got the idea from their conquerors, who taught and civilized them. But it was inevitable that in the artistic countries,² the adoption of Mithraism should involve the representing Mithra by images, like other deities. Nor was this all. One reason for regarding the Zend-Avesta as essentially ancient is the comparative simplicity of the Mithra cultus it sets forth. Just as happened with Christianity later, the spreading faith assimilated all sorts of ancient symbolisms and new complications of ritual ; and Mithra later figures for us in the strange symbolic figures of the lion-headed serpentine god, but above all in that of the slayer of the bull. Whence came that conception ? There are many explanations. It has been variously decided that the bull slain by Mithra is the symbol of the earth, the symbol of the moon, the bull of the zodiac, and the cosmogonic bull of the Magian system.³ Now, any one who has studied such a work of ancient theosophy as Plutarch's treatise on Isis and Osiris,—a singularly interesting document, by the way,—will be perfectly prepared to believe that for the ancients the bull of Mithra could represent *all four of these things*. In that famous treatise, Isis and Osiris and Typhon successively represent a number of different principles in nature,—sun, moon, moisture, the Nile, generative warmth, injurious heat, wind, and so on,—shifting and exchanging their places, till it becomes plain that the old theosophy was

¹ *De Errori Profanarum Religionum*, v. Compare Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite, Epist. vii. ad Polycarp., cited in Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Proleg. c. 3 ; and in Cudworth, Intel. Syst., Harrison's ed., i. 482. In a passage in the *Yasna*, there is mention of "the two divine Mithras" (Lenormant, as quoted, citing Burnouf).

² I do not quite follow Canon Rawlinson's meaning in the statement (Seventh Oriental Monarchy, p. 632 : Cp. Spiegel, as cited, S. 15), that "the Persian system was further tainted with idolatry in respect of the worship of Mithra." For that matter, however, the "idolatry" of antiquity is on all fours with the reverence of images under Christianity.

³ Hammer-Purgstall, *Mithriaca*, Caen and Paris, 1833, p. 31.

but a ceaseless flux of more or less congruous fancies. We may depend upon it that Mithraism was as hospitable to mystic meanings as Osirianism. It is perfectly intelligible and probable that Mithra slaying the bull should have meant the rays of the sun penetrating the earth, and so creating life for mundane creatures, as the dog¹ feeds on the blood of the slain bull. But those who adopt this as the whole explanation,² overlook a principle bound up with the very origin of Mithraism—the significance of the bull as one of those signs of the zodiac through which the sun passed in his annual course. It is certain that the zodiac was the source of very much of the symbolism and mysticism of those ancient cults which their priest-hoods associated with the sun, not to speak of those whose priest-hoods professedly repudiated sun-worship. And one of the most important facts established by the collection and comparison of ancient monuments³ is, that the Mithraic cultus connects symbolically with an Assyrian cultus far older. You have all seen copies of that common Assyrian monument, in which a divine or kingly personage slays a lion, thrusting a sword through him. There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that these successive religious representations of the slaying of the lion and the slaying of the bull rest on a zodiacal system of sacred symbolism, in which the slaying of a given animal means either the passing of the sun into a particular sign of the zodiac at a particular season of the year, or the slaying of the animal represented as a special sacrifice. The zodiac, which is of immense antiquity, has come to be conventionalized—that is to say, it is fixed, so that the signs have long ceased to coincide with the actual constellations whose names they bear. But originally the students of the stars must needs have had regard to the actual constellations. And this carries us very far back indeed. If it be right to decide that the slaying of the bull originally pointed to the sun's entering the sign of the Bull at the vernal equinox (and this is strongly suggested by the hostile function assigned in the monuments to the scorpion, which is the opposing sign, and would represent the autumnal equinox),⁴ then this symbol dates back, probably, more than 3,000 years before the Christian era; while the symbol of the slaying of the lion would signify the sun's entrance into Leo at Midsummer in the same period. In point of fact, astronomy tells us that, by the precession of the equinoxes, the constellation of the Bull had ceased to be the sun's place at the vernal equinox for about 2,100 years before the reign of Augustus, the constellation of the Ram taking its place. But, just as the symbol of the slaying of the lion had, on this theory, held its ground in religion after the bull played a similar part, so did the sign

¹ For another signification of the dog here, see Mr. King's *Gnostics and their Remains*, 2nd ed., p. 137. Compare the Osirian theory in Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, 44.

² King, pp. 135, 136.

³ See the series in Lajard's *Atlas*.

⁴ Lenormant (*Chaldean Magic*, p. 56) rejects the idea that there was an astronomical significance in the Assyrian bull-slaying; but his arguments do not amount to a refutation. He rests his denial on one fragment of a conjuration, which makes demons bulls.

of the Bull play its part in symbol and ceremony long after the sun had begun to enter the constellation Aries at the sacred season. What gives the zodiacal theory its crowning vindication, however, is the remarkable fact that, while the bull holds its place on the monuments at the Christian era,—that being an age of immense diffusion of cults and mysteries among the general population of the civilized world,—we find at this very period, in connection with the worship of Mithra, as with that of Dionysos¹ or Bacchus, an actual ceremony of slaying a ram in honour of the Sun-God. In Persia, the sign Aries, the ram, was known as the lamb;² and in the Mithraic mysteries at the Christian era, it was a lamb that was slain. That fact, as we shall see, has further bearings; but thus far it surely counts for much as a proof of the zodiacal element in the symbolism of the ancient sophisticated sun-worshippers. And though the notion of a Fish-God is deeply rooted in several of the older Eastern religions, I know of no more plausible explanation than the zodiacal one of the early Christian habit of calling Jesus Christ the Fish. The sign of the Fishes comes next the Ram in the zodiac; and that constellation was actually taking the place of the Ram, at the spring equinox, about the time this symbol came into use. We know with certainty, too, from Origen, that the Mithraic mysteries included an elaborate representation of the movements of the stars and planets, and the movements of the disembodied human soul among these.³

Every wide-spread religion, however, is necessarily a complex of many ideas; and in the cult of Mithra this is abundantly seen. The image of the slaying of the bull, whatever its original bearing, came to be associated specially with the idea of sacrifice and purification; and the great vogue of the Phrygian institutions of the Taurobolia and Criobolia,⁴ or purification by the blood of bulls and rams, must have reacted on Mithraism. In connection with these we have the literal and original meaning of the phrase “washed in the blood of the lamb”; the doctrine being, that resurrection and eternal life were secured by drenching or sprinkling with the actual blood of a sacrificial bull or ram (often doubtless a lamb, that being a common sacrifice from time immemorial). Thus we have such mortuary inscriptions as “*Taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus.*”⁵ But whereas there was a constant tendency in the mystical systems to substitute symbolism for concrete usages, the Mithraists may be surmised to have

¹ The ram “supplied the favourite Dionysiak sacrifice.” R. Brown, “The Great Dionysiak Myth,” ii. 65. In one version of the Dionysian myth, Zeus changes Dionysos into a ram to save him from Hera. Smith’s Dict., art. *Dionysus*, citing Hyginus and Theon.

² Among the Jews, a male lamb one day old was called a ram, *Ayl*. Jastrow’s Talmudic Dict., s.v. *איל*.

³ Against Celsus, vi. 22.

⁴ Referred to by Firmicus, xxviii.

⁵ Given in note on Firmicus in ed. Hackiana, 1672, p. 56. See it also in Orelli, No. 2352. See further No. 1899, 1900, 2130, 2199, 2322, 2326, 2328, 2330, 2331, 2351, 2353, 2361. Compare Boeckh, 6012, *b*, *c*. Here the taurobolium and criobolium are directly connected with Mithraism. On the “blood shed for all” see Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 1865, p. 761. n.

ultimately performed their sacrificial rites in a less crude form than that described by Prudentius.¹

Resembling other cults at some points, the Mithraic was markedly peculiar in others. The great speciality of this worship, as we learn from several writers, is that it was carried on in caves—so far at least as its special mysteries were concerned—the cave being considered so all-important that where natural caves did not exist the devotees made artificial ones.² Porphyry puts it on record³ that the “Persians, mystically signifying the descent of the soul into the sublunary regions, and its regression thence, initiate the mystic in a place which they call a cavern. For, as Eubulus says, Zoroaster was the first who consecrated, in the neighbouring mountains of Persia, an orbicular cave, in which there were flowers and fountains, in honour of Mithra, the maker and father of all things—a cave, according to Zoroaster, bearing a resemblance to the world, *which was fabricated by Mithra*. But the things contained in the cavern . . . were symbols of the mundane elements and climates.”

This explanation of the cave was not improbably suggested by a well-known passage in Plato; and it is obvious that the custom must have had some simpler origin. It is easy to understand how to half-civilized man caves would have a hundred mysterious significances, as places for dwelling or meeting made by the Deity himself; and fire- or sun-worshippers would have the special motives supplied by finding in caves the remains of the fires made by the earlier men, and by the not unnatural theory that the sun himself went into some cave when he went below the horizon at night. Indeed Porphyry admits that caves in the most remote periods of antiquity were consecrated to the gods, before temples were consecrated to them. Hence the Curetes in Crete dedicated a cavern to Jupiter; in Arcadia, a cave was sacred to the moon and to Lycean Pan; and in Naxos, to Bacchus. “But,” he adds, “wherever Mithra was known, they propitiated the god in a cavern.”⁴

It appears that the greatest sanctity attached to caves in the living rock, and there are many remains of Mithraic altars cut in rocks;⁵ nay more, the rock came to be specially associated with Mithra, who was named “rock-born”; and the phrase, “Θεὸς ἐκ πέτρας, God out of the rock,” or “Mithras out of the rock,” became one of the commonest formulas of the cultus.⁶ In these rock-caves, then, or in artificial caves, the priests of

¹ X. 1009-1050. Concerning the taurobolium at Athens, see Dittenberger, *Inscr. Attica et. Roman.*, 172, 173. Cp. King, “Gnostics,” p. 154.

² Caves were therefore made in honour of Mithra, as temples in honour of other gods. See Orelli, 2340, 2341.

³ On the Cave of the Nymphs, ii. Cf. Firmicus, v.

⁴ As cited, viii. Cf. Statius, *Theb.* i. 719-720.

⁵ See the engravings in Jacob Bryant's *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, ed. 1774, 4to, vol. i., pp. 232, 234, 294.

⁶ Firmicus, *De Error.* xxi.; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 70; Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, i. 7 (Migne, xxiii., col. 219); Windischmann pp. 61, 62, citing Commodianus and Johannes Lydus.

Mithras celebrated the habitual rites and the special mysteries of their religion. How far they practised daily or weekly devotions is one of the matters as to which we have no positive information ; but there are many reasons for believing that the worship was habitual.¹ The rising sun would be daily hailed with joy, as among the Jewish Essenes, and sun-worshippers everywhere ; and during the night, when the sun was hidden, special prayers would be offered up. The first day of the week, Sunday, was of course from time immemorial consecrated to Mithra by Mithraists ; and as the sun-god was pre-eminently "the Lord," Sunday was "the Lord's day" long before the Christian era. On that day there must have been special Mithraic worship. But we have some exact information as to the two chief Mithraic ceremonies or festivals, those of Christmas and Easter, the winter solstice and the vernal equinox, the birthday of the sun-god, and the period of his sacrifice and his triumph.² That Christmas is a solar festival of unknown antiquity, which the early Christians appropriated to Christ in total ignorance of the real time of his birth, is no longer denied by competent Christian scholars—when they happen to allude to the subject. That Easter is also a solar³ festival is perhaps not so freely recognised. But we know not only that Mithras and Osiris (and Horus), like so many other solar deities, were especially adored at the vernal equinox,⁴ but that in these worships there were special formulas representing, apparently at this date,⁵ the symbolical death of the deity, the search for his body, and the finding of it. The Christian Firmicus wrathfully tells how the priests of Osiris, who have a representation of the god in the most secret part of their temples, mourn for a certain number of days (presumptively forty,⁶ = Lent), while professedly searching for the scattered members of his mangled body, till at length they feign to have found it, when they finish their mourning and rejoice, saying, "We have found him : rejoice we."⁷ And we learn from Tertullian that Osiris in the mysteries was buried and came to life again.⁸ But as to Mithraism the details are still more precise. The worshippers, Firmicus tells us,⁹ lay a stone image by night on a bier and liturgically mourn for it, this image representing the dead god. This symbolical corpse is then placed in the tomb, and after a time is withdrawn from the tomb, whereupon the worshippers

¹ Under the Mazdean system, prayer was offered to Mithra thrice daily ; at dawn, at noon, and at sunset. (Rawlinson, "Seventh Oriental Monarchy," p. 628, citing Spiegel, *Tradit. Schrift. d. Pars.*, p. 135.)

² See Julian, *Upon the Sovereign Sun*, Bohn trans., pp. 249-251 ; Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 1865, p. 275.

³ Or rather a luni-solar. It is singular that this movable feast should be celebrated as an anniversary of an event with apparently no orthodox misgivings.

⁴ Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i. 18. Cp. Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 1865, p. 760.

⁵ But see Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris*, 39, which creates a difficulty.

⁶ Compare the forty nights mourning of the mysteries of Proserpine, *De Error.*, c. xxviii.

⁷ *De Error.*, ii.

⁸ Against Marcion, i. 13.

⁹ *De Error.*, xxiii.

rejoice, exhorting one another to be of good hope; lights are brought in; and the priest anoints the throats of the devotees, murmuring slowly: "Be of good courage; you have been instructed in the mysteries, and you shall have salvation from your sorrows." The parallel to a central episode in the Christian legend is sufficiently striking; but there is testimony from the same source¹ that a similar liturgy was gone through in connection with the burial and resurrection of Osiris.

This, however, was only one of the Mithraic mysteries, presumably celebrated once a year. We have further records of another enacted at the initiation of every new devotee, and probably repeated in some form frequently. Justin Martyr, in his first Apology,² after describing the institution of the Christian Lord's Supper, as narrated in the Gospels, goes on to say: "Which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water³ are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn." And this is borne out by Tertullian, who intimates⁴ that "the devil, by the mysteries of his idols, imitates even the main parts of the divine mysteries. He also baptizes his worshippers in water, and makes them believe that this purifies them of their crimes. . . . There Mithra sets his mark on the forehead of his soldiers; he celebrates the oblation of bread; he offers an image of the resurrection, and presents at once the crown and the sword; he limits his chief priest to a single marriage; he even has his virgins and his ascetics (*continentes*)."⁵ Again,⁶ the devil "has gone about to apply to the worship of idols those very things in which consists the administration of Christ's sacraments."

Reference is here made to a certain ceremony of initiation. The complete initiation of a worshipper, we know, was an elaborate and even a painful process, involving many austerities, trial by water, trial by fire, by cold, by hunger, by thirst, by scourging, by branding or bleeding,⁷ and the mock menace of death. Of these austerities different but vague and scanty accounts are given. According to some accounts they lasted fifteen days; according to others, for forty-eight:⁸ one old writer⁹ alleges eighty different kinds of trials. It is more likely that they numbered twelve, seeing

¹ *De Errore*, ii.

² c. 66.

³ The Elitonic Christians (the earliest), it will be remembered, celebrated the communion rite with bread and water (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, 30). And water was mixed with wine in later usage; see Bingham, *Christian Antiquities*, ed. 1855, v. 242.

⁴ *Præscr.*, c. 40. Cf. *De Bapt.*, c. 5; *De Corona*, c. 15.

⁵ *Præscr.*, 40.

⁶ On this see Mr. King's "Gnostics," p. 139, citing Aug. in Johann. i. 7; Mem. Revelation, xiii. 17; also Gregory Nazianzen's First Invect. ag. Julian, c. 70. (Bohn Julian, p. 39).

⁷ Sainte-Croix, *Recherches*, ii. 126, n.

⁸ Nonnus, cited by Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Syntag. i., c. 5; and by Windischmann, p. 69. See there also the important citation from Elias of Crete. Compare Suidas, as cited on p. 68. As to the origin of the trials, see Darmesteter on Mihr Yast, xxx. 122.

that on the Mithraic monuments we find representations of twelve episodes, doubtless corresponding to the twelve labours which we find in the stories of Hercules, Samson, and other sun-heroes; but probably also connected with the trials of the initiated.¹ More explicitly we know from Porphyry and from Jerome that the devotees were divided into a number of different degrees, symbolically marked by the names of birds and animals, and apparently by wearing, during some of the rites, the skins or heads of these animals. Porphyry² mentions grades of lions, lionesses, and crows, and higher grades of eagles and hawks; Jerome³ speaks of crow, gryphon, soldier, lion, Persian (or Perses), sun, Bromios=roarer (or, the bull), and father. Out of the various notices, partly by hypothesis, M. Lajard has constructed a not quite trustworthy scheme,⁴ representing twelve Mithraic degrees: three terrestrial, the soldier, the lion,⁵ and the bull: three ærial, the vulture, the ostrich, and the raven; three igneous, the gryphon, the horse, and the sun; and three divine, the grade of fathers, named eagle, sparrow-hawk, and father of fathers. It makes a sufficiently grotesque list, in this or any other form; but it is the old story—all religions are absurd to those who do not believe them;⁶ and it is not well for those who keep a private conservatory, however small, to throw stones.

We have thus far briefly examined what may be termed the skeleton or dry bones of the Mithraic religion, so far as we can trace them, at the period when it seemed to be successfully competing with Christianity. What of the inner life, the spiritual message and attraction which there must have been to give the cult its hold over the Roman Empire? Here it is that our ignorance becomes most sharply felt. So far as Christian zeal could suppress all good report of Mithraism, this was done, when Christianity—I will not say overthrew, but absorbed the Mithraic movement. To this day you find Christian scholars either saying or hinting that Mithraism was signalized in the Roman period by human sacrifices. I know no more disingenuous suggestion in the orthodox presentment of Paganism, profoundly prejudiced and unjust as that generally is. We do

¹ On the twelve episodes, cp. Sainte-Croix, as cited, with King, "Gnostics," p. 128. Compare the "twelve stoics," in the mysteries of Isis, mentioned by Apuleius (*Metam.*, B. xi.). There is a remarkable correspondence between the twelve Mithraic trials and twelve forms of Hindoo penance (especially as regards the last), as described by Maurice, "Indian Antiquities," 1794, v. 981. These twelve orders of fast include trials lasting fifteen days; and the whole would cover more than eighty days.

² On Abstinence from Animal Food, iv. 16.

³ *Epistola* cvii. (vii.) *ad Lolam*.

⁴ *Recherches sur le Culte Public et Mystères de Mithra*, ed. 1867, p. 132, *et seq.* The main authority for twelve degrees is Porphyry's citation from Pallas as to the signs of the zodiac; but M. Lajard's list is not zodiacal. The grade of the ostrich is particularly ill made-out (p. 338).

⁵ Every animal's name used must have had a symbolical meaning. Thus we have it through Tertullian (Against Marcion, l. 13), that "the lions of Mithra are mysteries of arid and scorched nature."

⁶ There is a curious correspondence between M. Lajard's four grades and the emblems of the four evangelists given by Augustine: Matthew=lion, Mark=man (this order often reversed), Luke=ox, John=eagle. See "Variorum Teachers' Bible," *Aids to Students*, p. 10.

know that during the whole of the first three or four centuries it was charged against the Christians, by Jews or Pagans, that they were wont to sacrifice a child at their mysteries.¹ That charge was doubtless false, but it was constantly repeated. Now, the only kind of record founded on for the charge against Mithraism is one which utterly destroys that charge. Sainte-Croix, following a plainly worthless suggestion of the ecclesiastical historian Socrates,² was reckless enough to refer³ to a passage in the life of Commodus by Lampridius, in the Augustan history, in support of his insinuation that Mithraism involved human sacrifice. But this passage⁴ explicitly says that Commodus "*polluted the rites of Mithras by a real homicide*, where it is usual for something to be said, or feigned to be done for the purpose of causing terror" (*quum illic aliquid ad speciem timoris vel dici vel fingi solent*). The same scholar makes another reference which equally serves to confute him;⁵ yet an English writer later speaks of "the dark and fearful mysteries" of Mithra, repeating the old insinuation.⁶ The Mithraic mysteries, save for the fact that they involved real austerities and a scenic representation of death, were no more dark and fearful than the Christian mysteries are known to have been, not to speak of what these are *said* to have been. There lies against them no such imputation of licence as was constantly brought against the midnight meetings of the Christians, or as is specifically brought by St. Paul against his own converts at Corinth. Their purpose was unquestionably moral as well as consolatory.⁷ In the words of Suidas, the worshipper went through his trials in order that he should become holy and passionless. In the course of the initiation, as we know from the unwilling admiration of Tertullian,⁸ the devotee, called the soldier of Mithras, was offered a crown, which it was his part to refuse, saying that Mithra was his crown. And everything points to the enunciation of a theory of expiation of and purification from sin, in which Mithras figured as mediator and saviour, actually undergoing a symbolic sacrifice, and certainly securing to his worshippers eternal life.⁹ As to the doctrine of immortality being pre-Christian, it is now quite unnecessary to speak; and the whole Mithraic symbolism implies such a teaching. On most of the bull monuments, you may remember, there stand beside Mithra two figures, one holding a raised and one a lowered torch. These signified primarily sunrise and sunset, or rising spring sun and sinking autumn sun; but, as Lessing long ago showed, they were also

¹ See Origen, *Against Celsus*, vi. 27; Cf. Minucius Felix, "*Octavius*," c. 9.

² B. iii., c. 2; B. v., c. 16.

³ *Recherches*, ii. 135.

⁴ Cap. 9. Sainte-Croix offers an extraordinary mistranslation of the passage.

⁵ To Porphyry, *On Abstinence*, ii. 56; a passage which only says that down till the time of Hadrian it was the custom to sacrifice a virgin to *Minerva* at Laodicea.

⁶ Wright, "*The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*," 4th ed., p. 328. The insinuation is found also in the encyclopædias.

⁷ See Origen, *Against Celsus*, iii. 59. Cf. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, i. 497.

⁸ *De Corona*, c. 15.

⁹ See Garucci, *Les Mystères du Syncretisme Phrygien*, passim. Cf. Windischmann (S. 53), as to the older cultus.

that on the Mithraic monuments we find representations of twelve episodes, doubtless corresponding to the twelve labours which we find in the stories of Hercules, Samson, and other sun-heroes; but probably also connected with the trials of the initiated.¹ More explicitly we know from Porphyry and from Jerome that the devotees were divided into a number of different degrees, symbolically marked by the names of birds and animals, and apparently by wearing, during some of the rites, the skins or heads of these animals. Porphyry² mentions grades of lions, lionesses, and crows, and higher grades of eagles and hawks; Jerome³ speaks of crow, gryphon, soldier, lion, Persian (or Perses), sun, Bromios=roarer (or, the bull), and father. Out of the various notices, partly by hypothesis, M. Lajard has constructed a not quite trustworthy scheme,⁴ representing twelve Mithraic degrees: three terrestrial, the soldier, the lion,⁵ and the bull: three aerial, the vulture, the ostrich, and the raven; three igneous, the gryphon, the horse, and the sun; and three divine, the grade of fathers, named eagle, sparrow-hawk, and father of fathers. It makes a sufficiently grotesque list, in this or any other form; but it is the old story—all religions are absurd to those who do not believe them;⁶ and it is not well for those who keep a private conservatory, however small, to throw stones.

We have thus far briefly examined what may be termed the skeleton or dry bones of the Mithraic religion, so far as we can trace them, at the period when it seemed to be successfully competing with Christianity. What of the inner life, the spiritual message and attraction which there must have been to give the cult its hold over the Roman Empire? Here it is that our ignorance becomes most sharply felt. So far as Christian zeal could suppress all good report of Mithraism, this was done, when Christianity—I will not say overthrew, but absorbed the Mithraic movement. To this day you find Christian scholars either saying or hinting that Mithraism was signalized in the Roman period by human sacrifices. I know no more disingenuous suggestion in the orthodox presentment of Paganism, profoundly prejudiced and unjust as that generally is. We do

¹ On the twelve episodes, cp. Sainte-Croix, as cited, with King, "Gnostics," p. 128. Compare the "twelve stoics," in the mysteries of Isis, mentioned by Apuleius (*Metam.*, B. xi.). There is a remarkable correspondence between the twelve Mithraic trials and twelve forms of Hindoo penance (especially as regards the last), as described by Maurice, "Indian Antiquities," 1794, v. 981. These twelve orders of fast include trials lasting fifteen days; and the whole would cover more than eighty days.

² On Abstinence from Animal Food, iv. 16.

³ *Epistola cvil.* (vii.) *ad Latani.*

⁴ *Recherches sur le Culte Public et Mystères de Mithra*, ed. 1867, p. 132, *et seq.* The main authority for twelve degrees is Porphyry's citation from Pallas as to the signs of the zodiac; but M. Lajard's list is not zodiacal. The grade of the ostrich is particularly ill made-out (p. 338).

⁵ Every animal's name used must have had a symbolical meaning. Thus we have it through Tertullian (Against Marcion, l. 13), that "the lions of Mithra are mysteries of arid and scorched nature."

⁶ There is a curious correspondence between M. Lajard's four grades and the emblems of the four evangelists given by Augustine: Matthew=lion, Mark=man (this order often reversed), Luke=ox, John=eagle. See "Variorum Teachers' Bible," *Aids to Students*, p. 10.

know that during the whole of the first three or four centuries it was charged against the Christians, by Jews or Pagans, that they were wont to sacrifice a child at their mysteries.¹ That charge was doubtless false, but it was constantly repeated. Now, the only kind of record founded on for the charge against Mithraism is one which utterly destroys that charge. Sainte-Croix, following a plainly worthless suggestion of the ecclesiastical historian Socrates,² was reckless enough to refer³ to a passage in the life of Commodus by Lampridius, in the Augustan history, in support of his insinuation that Mithraism involved human sacrifice. But this passage⁴ explicitly says that Commodus "*polluted the rites of Mithras by a real homicide*, where it is usual for something to be said, or feigned to be done for the purpose of causing terror" (*quum illic aliquid ad speciem timoris vel dici vel fingi solent*). The same scholar makes another reference which equally serves to confute him;⁵ yet an English writer later speaks of "the dark and fearful mysteries" of Mithra, repeating the old insinuation.⁶ The Mithraic mysteries, save for the fact that they involved real austerities and a scenic representation of death, were no more dark and fearful than the Christian mysteries are known to have been, not to speak of what these are *said* to have been. There lies against them no such imputation of licence as was constantly brought against the midnight meetings of the Christians, or as is specifically brought by St. Paul against his own converts at Corinth. Their purpose was unquestionably moral as well as consolatory.⁷ In the words of Suidas, the worshipper went through his trials in order that he should become holy and passionless. In the course of the initiation, as we know from the unwilling admiration of Tertullian,⁸ the devotee, called the soldier of Mithras, was offered a crown, which it was his part to refuse, saying that Mithra was his crown. And everything points to the enunciation of a theory of expiation of and purification from sin, in which Mithras figured as mediator and saviour, actually undergoing a symbolic sacrifice, and certainly securing to his worshippers eternal life.⁹ As to the doctrine of immortality being pre-Christian, it is now quite unnecessary to speak; and the whole Mithraic symbolism implies such a teaching. On most of the bull monuments, you may remember, there stand beside Mithra two figures, one holding a raised and one a lowered torch. These signified primarily sunrise and sunset, or rising spring sun and sinking autumn sun; but, as Lessing long ago showed, they were also

¹ See Origen, *Against Celsus*, vi. 27; Cf. Minucius Felix, "*Octavius*," c. 9.

² B. iii., c. 2; B. v., c. 16.

³ *Recherches*, ii. 135.

⁴ Cap. 9. Sainte-Croix offers an extraordinary mistranslation of the passage.

⁵ To Porphyry, *On Abstinence*, ii. 56; a passage which only says that down till the time of Hadrian it was the custom to sacrifice a virgin to *Minerva* at Laodicea.

⁶ Wright, "*The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*," 4th ed., p. 328. The insinuation is found also in the encyclopædias.

⁷ See Origen, *Against Celsus*, iii. 59. Cf. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, i. 497.

⁸ *De Corona*, c. 15.

⁹ See Garucci, *Les Mystères du Syncretisme Phrygien*, passim. Cf. Windischmann (*S.* 53), as to the older cultus.

the ancient symbols for life and death. Now we can understand how such a cultus, with an elaborate ceremonial and an impressive initiation, with the attractions of august and solemn mysteries and the promise of immortal life, could spread throughout the Roman Empire in the age in which the primitive Roman religion crumbled away before the advance of far more highly specialized and complicated cults. Above all was it popular in the army, which really seems to have been to some extent a school of moral strength and order at a time when an appalling abjection was overtaking the Roman world, men reverencing rank as dogs reverence men. One of the first stages in the initiation, for men, consisted in the devotee receiving a sword, and being called a soldier of Mithra.¹ Thus Mithraism was specially the faith of the soldiery;² and in doing honour to the invincible sun-god Mithra—*Deo Soli Invicta Mithræ*, as the monuments have it—the Emperor Constantine vied with the most loyal Mithraists long after his so-called conversion to Christianity.³ But there were also women worshippers, as we know from at least the grade of lionesses—sometimes oddly named that of hyænas, from a slight blunder in the Greek text.⁴ And I think we may infer that this cultus, with its austerities and its solemnities, attracted, on the whole, men and women of the better type. There can be little doubt that the practice of lavish charity among the early Christians attracted to the churches worthless characters, and so promoted demoralization. Mutual help there probably was among Mithraists; but we find no organized almsgiving.

But now comes the great question, How came such a cultus to die out of the Roman and Byzantine Empires after making its way so far and holding its ground so long? The answer to that question has never, I think, been fully given, and is for the most part utterly evaded, though part of it has been suggested often enough. The truth is, that Mithraism was not overthrown; it was merely transformed.

Of course we are told that the Mithraic rites and mysteries were borrowed and imitated from Christianity.⁵ But the plainest refutation of this notion, as has been pointed out by M. Havet,⁶ lies in the language of those Christian fathers who spoke of Mithraism. Three of them, as we have seen, speak of the Mithraic resemblances to Christian rites as being the work of devils. Now, if the Mithraists had simply imitated the historic Christians, the obvious course for the latter would be simply to say so. In that case there would be no need to talk of demons; it would be far more effective to charge human plagiarism. Justin Martyr expressly argues that the demons anticipated the Christian mysteries and prepared parodies of

¹ Tertullian, *De Corona*, xv.; Garucci, *Mystères du Syncretisme Phrygien*, 1854, p. 34.

² Of old, as we have seen, Mithra was a war-god.

³ See his coins. Compare Gibbon, ch. 20, 28.

⁴ See De Sacy's note on Sainte-Croix, li. 128.

⁵ So Sainte-Croix, *Recherches*, li. 147; and Beugnot, *Hist. de la Destr. du Pag.*, l. 157, 158, 161.

⁶ *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, iv. 133.

them beforehand. "When I hear," he says in his Dialogue with Trypho,¹ "when I hear, Trypho, that Perseus was begotten of a virgin, I understand that the deceiving serpent counterfeited also this." Nobody pretends that the Perseus myth, or the Pagan virgin myth in general, is later than Christianity. Justin Martyr, indeed, is perhaps the most foolish of all the Christian fathers; but what he says about the anticipatory action of the demon or demons plainly underlies the argumentation also of Tertullian and Julius Firmicus.² The Mithraic mysteries, then, of the burial and resurrection of the Lord, the Mediator and Saviour,—burial in a rock tomb and resurrection from that tomb—the sacrament of bread and water, and the marking on the forehead with a mystic mark,—all these were in practice, like the Egyptian search for the lost corpse of Osiris, and the representation of his entombment and resurrection, before the publication of the Christian Gospel of a Lord who was buried in a rock tomb, and rose from that tomb on the day of the sun, or of the Christian mystery of Divine communion, with bread and water or bread and wine, which last were before employed also in the mysteries of Bacchus, sun-god and wine-god, doubtless as representing *his* body and blood.³ Nor was this all. Firmicus⁴ informs us that the devil, in order to leave nothing undone for the destruction of souls, had beforehand resorted to deceptive imitations of the cross of Christ. Not only did they in Phrygia fix a young man to a tree in the worship of the Mother of the Gods, and in other cults imitate the crucifixion⁵ in similar ways, but in one mystery in particular the Pagans were wont to consecrate a tree and, towards midnight, to slay a ram at the foot of it. This cult may or may not have been the Mithraic; there is a very strong presumption that it was. You have all seen a strange Christian symbol in which Christ is represented as a lamb or ram, carrying by one forefoot a cross. Now, we know from Porphyry⁶ that in the mysteries "a place near the equinoctial circle was assigned to Mithra as an appropriate seat. And on this account he bears the sword of the Ram [Aries], which is a sign of Mars [Ares]." The sword of the Ram, we may take it, was

¹ c. 70.

² Plutarch states (Life of Pompey, c. 24) that Mithraism was first introduced to Rome through the Cilician pirates, whom Pompey put down. Paul, as M. Havet remarks, would be in the way of knowing the cults of Cilicia. Tarsus, indeed, was a Mithraic centre. See Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 758.

³ I have sought to show (*National Reformer*, June 15th, 1890), that the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 23-27 is certainly interpolated in whole or in part, probably by the same hand that manipulated xv. 5 (see *National Reformer*, November 27th, and December 4th, 1887). If this argument be valid, and I think it is, we are left with Paul practising a Holy Supper of which he has no Jesuine record. And now compare 1 Cor. x. 21.

⁴ *De Erroribus*, xxviii.

⁵ Suggestions of the crucifix appear in the Mithraic monuments. See the development from the winged figure, in Lajard's "Atlas;" and compare the plate in Bryant, i. 294. That the "crown of thorns" is a variation on a nimbus has long been surmised. Mithra of course had a nimbus (Windischmann, p. 60). And the early Persian sun-god rode "with his hands lifted up towards immortality" (or heaven), "Mihr Yast," 31; in Darmesteter, ii. 152. For other connections, see *National Reformer*, Dec. 21, 1890.

⁶ On the Cave of the Nymphs, c. 11.

simply figured as the cross, since a sword is a cross.¹ Again, Porphyry explains² that "Mithra, as well as the bull, is the demiurgos and lord of generation." Here then would be a symbolical slaying, in which the deity is sacrificed by the deity;³ and we may safely infer that the symbolic ram in turn would be sacrificed by the Mithraists on the same principle; since we actually know that a slain lamb figured in their mysteries.⁴ Now, it is the historic fact that among the early Christians a ram or lamb was sacrificed in the Paschal mystery. It is disputed between Greeks and Latins whether at one time the slain lamb was offered on the altar, together with the mystical body of Christ; but it is admitted by Catholic writers—and this, by the way, is the origin of a certain dispute about singing the *Agnus Dei* in church—that in the old *Ordo Romanus* a lamb was consecrated, slain, and eaten, on Easter Day, by way of a religious rite.⁵ Of this lamb, too, the blood was received in a cup.⁶ Take again the curious circumstance that, whereas in the gospels Jesus is said to have been born in an inn stable, early Christian writers, as Justin Martyr⁷ and Origen,⁸ explicitly say he was born in a cave. Now, in the Mithra myth, Mithra is both rock-born and born in a cave; and a later saying represents him as also supernaturally born of a virgin.⁹ And it is remarkable that whereas a cave was (and I believe is) shown as the birthplace of Jesus at Bethlehem, Saint Jerome actually complained¹⁰ that in his day the Pagans celebrated the worship of Thammuz (= Adonis), and presumably therefore the festival of the birth of the sun—Christmas Day—at that very cave.¹¹

Other correspondences might easily be traced; as, the building of churches looking towards the east,¹² and the number of the Apostles;¹³ but

¹ Note, on this, the astronomical "crossing" of lines at the "first point of Aries" (see English or Chambers' Encyc., art. Zodiac); and see it imaged in the old figure in Brown's ed. of Aratos.

² Place cited.

³ The people of Crete destroyed a bull to represent the destruction of Bacchus (Firmicus, vi.).

⁴ Garucci, *Les Mystères du Syncretisme Phrygien*, p. 34. And see the lamb in the monument of the winged bull-slaying Mithra, in Lajard's *Atlas*.

⁵ See Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, ed. 1855, iii. 244, 245.

⁶ Casalius, *De Veterib. Christ. Ritib.*, ii. 4, cited by Dupuis. It is noteworthy, that the priestess of Apollo's oracle at Larissa became possessed by the god once a month on tasting the blood of a sacrificed lamb (Pausanias, ii. 24).

⁷ Dialogue with Trypho, c. 78.

⁸ Against Celsus, i. 51. Compare the Apocryphal gospels, Protev., xii. 14; Infancy, i. 6, xii. 14. Note, too, that Dionysos was said to have been nurtured in a cave (Pausanias, iii. 24; Diodorus Siculus, iii. 67).

⁹ Elisseus the Armenian historian (d. 480), cited by Windischmann, S. 61, 62.

¹⁰ Epist. 58, ad Paulinum (Migne, *Patrologia Cursus Completus*, ser. i., vol. xxii., col. 581).

¹¹ Dionysos, too, it should be noted, was worshipped in caves. Pausanias, ii. 23; Porphyry, cited above. So also were Apollo, Hermes, Hercules, Demeter, and Poseidon (Pausanias, iii. 25; vii. 25; viii. 15, 36, 42; x. 32). Apollo's resting-place is a cave (Pindar, *Olymp.* vii. 57); Jupiter is cave-born, and worshipped in a cave (Hesiod, *Theog.*, 483; Strabo, xvi. 2, § 38). Hermes is born at a cave mouth (Homeric Hymn).

¹² This, of course, is a usage of almost all religions. Only we know that the Mithraic worship followed it. See Wellbeloved's *Eburacum*, p. 85.

¹³ Apart from the more pressing question whether the Christian legend does not rest on

these are enough, I think, to prove the point. Of course those who loyally accept the Christian records as unquestionably true will not be influenced by such considerations; whatever method they may adopt to explain away those parallels which the Fathers simply set down to the account of the demon. But those of you who, like myself, cannot see your way to accept as historic truth the central incidents of the Gospel story—those of you may see in the mystic rites of Mithraism and other old solar religions—rites which symbolized abstract ideas and not concrete facts—the scientific explanation of the Christian phases of supernaturalism. In this way the sacrosanct episodes of the holy supper and the resurrection from the rock tomb, as well as the legend of the birth at Yuletide in a cave,¹ the Sunday worship, and the Easter tragedy, all become finally intelligible to the eye of science. And when we find, in the First Epistle of Peter (ii. 4, 5), a phrase about Jesus being a "living stone," and read in the gospels how the Lord said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church," we turn from such an obviously unhistoric utterance back to the Mithraic rites, and see in the sacred rock of Mithra, the rock from which the god comes, the source of the Roman legend.²

Of course it was not merely Mithraism that was assimilated by Christianity. The new faith absorbed matter from many sides. Take, for instance, the Fourth Gospel, which, written under Alexandrian influences, represents some of the later accretions; and turn to such a story as that of the seamless robe of Jesus. Here is a new myth-motive: whence did it come? Turn to Osirianism, and you find that of Osiris it was taught³ that his robe, unlike that of Isis, was one, whole, indivisible, that robe being the universal light—the ideal robe of the sun—whereas the light of the moon

the probable fact of an institution of twelve strictly Jewish Apostles (the true "Twelve Apostles" of the *Didaché* so much discussed in recent years), it has to be noted that Mithra was represented as surrounded by the twelve signs of the zodiac in a particular order, beginning on the right with Aquarius and ending on the left with Capricorn, and that this usage was imitated by the Christians. See the admissions of Wellbeloved (p. 86), as to the zodiacal arch of the Church of St. Margaret's in Walmgate, York. Aquarius to the Christian sense would doubtless represent Peter, especially as the old zodiacs connected this sign with fishing. Note that the old festival of Peter at Rome (Jan. 18th) coincided with the sun's entering Aquarius in the calendar.

¹ Even the "stable" story has a curious connection with Mithraism. See the Greek formula in Firmicus (v. passage corrupt); "The sacred heifers have lowed; hold we the solemn feast of the most august father." M. Darmesteter holds (*Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 152, n.) that "the legends of gods born or reared in stables; among shepherds (Krishna); even that of Mithra as *perporyerhs*, in virtue of the synonymy of stone, mountain, stable—*adri-gotra*,"—all derive from the widespread bull or cow myth. But for an interesting astronomical signification of the stable (=the Augean), see Dupuis, *Origine de tous les Cultes*, ed. 1835-6, vii. 104.

² The stone myth has very wide bearings. Note the passage in Daniel ii. 34; also the Mazdean element in Zechariah iii. 9. The "seven eyes" are certainly connected with the seven Amshaspands or planetary gods—of whom Mithra was chief (Windischmann, p. 62; Seel, p. 215), as was also Ormazd, according to other texts (Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 38). The "fair mltré" raises the difficult question as to the origin of that name.

³ Plutarch, On Isis and Osiris, c. 78. Compare Jamblichus, On the Egyptian Mysteries, c. ix.

is variable and chequered, and the robe of Isis accordingly is so : both robes being actually so represented in the mysteries. In the Egyptian teaching, however, we have a poetic idea ; in the Christian legend it becomes a meaningless concrete myth, tied to a trivial prophecy. Take again the late miracle story of the turning of water into wine. Here is an episode without spiritual dignity—one of the least noble of all the miracle stories. Whence came it ? Ask yourself what it is that in actual Nature may be said to turn water into wine, and you soon get the answer. It is the sun, which drives the sap through branch and leaf, and ripens it into fruit and exquisite juice. And when we find that in connection with the worship of Bacchus, sun-god and wine-god, there was in the island of Andros a fountain which was said to yield wine during the yearly festival of the god, at the nones of January,¹ we need hardly go farther. The fact that the Catholic Church actually celebrates the miracle of Cana at the date at which the Pagans celebrated the Dionysian wine miracle is only a slight additional proof. In the same way we may reasonably surmise that the story of the scourging of the dealers in the temple is a Judaic application of the idea in the figures of the scourge-bearing god, found alike in Egyptian, in Assyrian, and in Gnostic monuments.

Now, these developments of mystical doctrine and symbolism into concrete myth point to another part of the explanation of the supersedence of Mithraism by Christianity. Religions, we say, like organisms and opinions, struggle for survival, and the fittest survive. That is to say, that one survives which is fittest for the environment—not fittest from the point of view of another and higher environment. Now, what was the religion that was fittest, that was best adapted, for the populations of the decaying Roman Empire, in which ignorance and mean subjection were slowly corroding alike intelligence and character, leaving the civilized provinces unable to hold their ground against the barbarians ? Well, an unwarlike population, for one thing, wants a sympathetic and emotional religion ; and here, though Mithraism has many attractions, Christianity had more. The beautiful and immortal youth of the older sun-worships, Apollo, Mithras, Dionysos, was always soluble into a mysterious abstraction : in the Christian legend the god was humanized in the most literal way ; and for the multitude the concrete deity must needs replace the abstract. The Gospels gave a literal story : the divine man was a carpenter, and ate and drank with the poorest of the poor. So with the miracles. The priesthoods of the older religions always explained to the initiated, in the mysteries, the mystical meaning which was symbolized by the concrete myths ; and in some early Christian writers, as notably Origen, you find a constant attempt so to explain away concrete miracle and other stories as allegories. But gradually

¹ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, ii. 106 (103), xxxi. 13. Pausanias, vi. 26. Note, too, the story in Pausanias of the placing of empty jars in a locked room in the temple, and finding them full of wine next day. See it also in Athenæus, i. 61, citing Theopompus the Chian (fl. B.C. 350). Compare the myth of the three sisters of Andros in Ævid, *Metamorph.* xii. 650-654.

the very idea of allegory died out of the Christian intelligence; and priests as well as people came to take everything literally and concretely, till miracles became everyday occurrences. This was the religion for the dark ages, for the new northern peoples which had not gone through the Pagan evolution of cults, and symbolisms, and mysticisms, but whose own traditional faith was too vague and primitive to hold its ground against the elaborate Christian theology and ritual. But that was not all. The fatal weakness of Mithraism, as pitted against Christianity, was that its very organization was esoteric. Now, an esoteric institution can never take hold of the ignorant masses. Mithraism was always a sort of freemasonry, never a public organization. What the Christians did was to start, like Rome herself, from a republican basis—for, as Dean Milman has put it,¹ the first churches were, ecclesiastically speaking, Greek republican groups—and then to build up a great organization on the model of that of republican and imperial Rome—an organization so august that the very tradition of it could serve the later world to live by for a thousand years. The Christian Church renewed the spell of imperial Rome, and brought actual force to make good intellectual weakness. And so we read that the Mithraic worship was by Christian physical force suppressed in Rome and Alexandria, about the end of the fourth century.² Complete suppression, of course, could not be so accomplished; and Mithraic usages long survived. Even in the eighth century we find Church councils commanding proselytes no more to pay worship to fanes and rocks;³ and there were other survivals.⁴ But that was a trifle compared to the actual survival of Mithraic symbols and rites in the very worship of Christ. As to the sacrifice of the lamb we have seen; and though, at the end of the seventh century, a general council ventured to resist the general usage of picturing Christ as a lamb, the veto was useless; the symbol survived. Some Mithraic items went, but more remained. The Christian bishop went through a ceremony of espousing the Church, following the old mystery in which occurred the formula, "Hail to thee, new spouse; hail, new light."⁵ His mitre was called a crown, or tiara, which answered to the headdress of Mithra and the Mithraic priests, as to those of the priests of Egypt; he wore red military boots, now said to be "emblematical of that spiritual warfare on which he had entered"; in reality, doubtless borrowed from the military worship of Mithra, dear to the first Christian emperor. And the higher mysteries of communion, divine sacrifice, and resurrection, as we have seen, were as much Mithraic as Christian; so that a Mithraist could turn to the Christian worship and find his main rites unimpaired, lightened only of the burden

¹ History of Latin Christianity, 3rd ed., i. 36.

² Jerome, *Epist. cvii. ad Latam* (Migne, xxii., col. 869); Socrates, *Ec. Hist.*, B. v., c. 16.

³ "Nullus Christianus ad fana, vel ad Petras votas reddere præsumat," *Indic. Paganarum in Consilio Leptinensi*, ad ann. Christ. 743; cited by Bryant, *Analysis*, i. 294.

⁴ See note by Mosheim on Cudworth, Harrison's ed., i. 478.

⁵ Firmicus, xx.

of initiative austerities, stripped of the old obscure mysticism, and with all things turned to the literal and the concrete, in sympathy with the waning of knowledge and philosophy throughout the world. The Mithraic Christians actually continued to celebrate Christmas Day as the birthday of the sun, despite the censures of the Pope.¹ When they listened to the Roman litany of the holy name of Jesus, they knew they were listening to the very epithets of the sun-god—god of the skies, purity of the eternal light, king of glory, sun of justice, strong god, father of the ages to come, angel of great counsel. Their priests had been wont to say that “he of the cap” was “himself a Christian.”² They knew that the good shepherd was a name of Apollo;³ that Mithra, like Hermes and Jesus, carried the lamb⁴ on his shoulders; that both were mediators, both creators, both judges of the dead; that the chief mysteries of the two cults were the same. Their mystic rock, Petra, was presented to them in the concrete as the rock Peter, the foundation of the Church. Their solar midnight worship was preserved in midnight services, which carried on the purpose of the midnight meetings of the early Christians, who had simply followed Essenian, Egyptian, and Mithraic usage; there being no basis for the orthodox notion that these secret meetings were due to fear of persecution. Their *mizd*, or sacred cake, was copied in the *mass*, which probably copied the very name.⁵ And whereas the religion of Mithra had only indirectly and mystically provided for that human instinct which made the great goddess-worships⁶ of antiquity, Christianity appealed to it directly and concretely, taking from an older faith the very image of Isis the virgin, carrying her babe in her arms, as Alitta, the Syrian goddess, had done;⁷ taking from the temples of Paganism the very statues of black basalt which represented Isis, and calling them by the name of Maria;⁸ just as, by the same law of assimilation, the Pagan faith in multitudinous local deities was conciliated and re-established by the institution of a multitude of miracle-working and prayer-hearing saints, as well as of locally miraculous shrines of the virgin.

¹ See the sermons of Saint Leo, xli. 6, cited by Dupuis and Havet, and by Gieseler, *Compend. of Ec. Hist.* 1. Eng. trans., 1846, ii. 43. Others than Mithraists, of course, would offend, Christmas being an Osirian and Adonisian festival also. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i. 18.

² Augustine in Joh. i., Dis. 7; cited in King, *Gnostics*, p. 119.

³ Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i. 17.

⁴ Or the bull. See Lajard's "Atlas," Pl. xci.; and Garucci, as cited. It is now generally admitted that the Christian figure of the lamb-bearing Good Shepherd is taken from the statues of Hermes *Kriophoros*, the Ram-bearer (Pausanias, iv. 33). But see also Jastrow's *Talmudic Dict.* s.v. כִּי־בָרָא.

⁵ King, *Gnostics*, p. 124, following Seel.

⁶ Yet there are signs of combination of Mithraism with the goddess cults of the Empire. Eunapius (cited in edit. note on Hammer-Purgstall, *Mithriaca*, p. 22) represents the same priest as hierophant of the Eleusinia, and father of the initiation of Mithra; and Apuleius (*Metamorphoses*, B. xi.—Bohn's ed., pp. 238, 241.) speaks of "the priest Mithras," in the mysteries of Isis. Again we find Mithra identified with Sebasteus, son of the Phrygian Cybele (Garucci, "*Mystères*," pp. 14, 18; Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 761).

⁷ See the figure in Layard, *Disc. in the Ruins of Nin. and Bab.*, 1853. p. 477; copied in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i. 257.

⁸ King, *Gnostics*, p. 173.

We are taught that at that era the world entered on a new way of life and of philosophy, breaking wholly with the past. *Excitabilis superstitio!* This, too, is folly.

It has chanced, indeed, that those Christian sects which most fully adopted the theosophies of Paganism have disappeared under the controlling power of the main organization, which, as I have said, held by a necessity of its existence to a concrete and literal system, and for the same reason to a rigidly fixed set of dogmas. We know that the Gnostics adopted Mithra, making his name into a mystic charm, from which (spelling it *Μεθρας*) they got the number 365, as from the mystic name Abraxas.¹ The more reason why Mithras should be tabooed by the organized Church. Thus, then, you can understand why the very name seemed at length to be blotted out. There were in antiquity, we know,² quite a number of elaborate treatises setting forth the religion of Mithra; and every one of these has been destroyed by the care of the Church.³ And yet, despite all forcible suppression, not only do the monuments of the faith remain to tell how for centuries it distanced its rival; not only do its rites and ceremonies remain as part of the very kernel of the Christian worship; but its record remains unknowingly graven in the very legend on the lintel of the great Christian temple of Rome,⁴ destined to teach to later times a lesson of human history, and of the unity of human religion, more enduring than the sectarian faith that is proclaimed within.

¹ Windischmann, S. 59, citing Jerome, in *Anas*, c. 3.

² Porphyry, On Abstinence from Animal Food, iv. 16, and elsewhere.

³ It is remarkable that even the treatise of Firmicus is mutilated at a passage (v.) where he seems to be accusing Christians of following Mithraic usages; and at the beginning, where he may have made a similar proposition.

⁴ "Thou art Petros. and upon this Rock I will build My Church."

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT GREEK AND LATIN TRIBES.

BY THE REV. SIR GEORGE W. COX, BART., M.A.

I.

If we limit the term religion to the direct relations of each individual man with God the Father of all men, it follows of necessity that that religion must be something altogether distinct from mythology. But whether the religion of Greeks, two or three thousand years ago, can be sharply and definitely severed from the mythology which they have bequeathed to us, is a question which calls urgently for an answer. No doubt it is quite possible that the swineherd Eumaios in the *Odyssey* may have had but a very imperfect acquaintance with the mythical stories of his age, and might have passed a poor examination in the intricacies of the Olympic theogony; but would this prove anything more than the fact that he was living in a world removed far away from what we might call the religious activity of his time? When, with his mind full of the iniquities of the suitors, he tells Odysseus that there are just gods who hate cruel deeds and honour justice and righteous works, he is making use of language which is free both from myth and from metaphor. The metaphor comes in when the Hesiodic poet speaks of the all-seeing and all-knowing eye of Zeus; but it is metaphor of a sort which it is impossible for us to avoid, and against which it is therefore useless for us to fight. We might bring together many utterances of a like spirit and form; but in what sense could we say that they represented the religion of the times to which the speakers belonged? To whatever extent we might carry our selections, we should still be dealing with the thoughts or the yearnings of individual minds; but we should be as far off as we were at starting from that which was supposed to be religion in any human society of the time.

The fact is, that in one sense we may, and in another we may not, draw distinctions between the religion of a people and their mythology. It is true, from one point of view, to say that the religion of Greeks of the age of Solon, or any other, did not consist simply in the fables told of Phœbus or Dionysos, or other deities; but it is equally true to say that the fables constituted the outer framework of all the Greek theological systems. In dealing with this question, we are always in danger of proving too much. We can always select expressions of faith uncoloured by the language of mythology, and these expressions may have come from persons very slenderly acquainted with the details of myths. We may say that by

religion we mean "our trust in one all-wise, all-powerful, eternal Being, the Ruler of the world, to whom we commit all our cares, and whose presence we feel not only in the outward world, but also in the warning voice within our hearts"; and we may maintain that of this religion alone was the Greek poet thinking when he expressed his longing for that perfect purity of word and deed, the law of which can never change or fail. We may speak of this as religion "ancient, primitive, and natural"; but we can reach the same religion through the complicated forms or schemes of any theology which the world has ever known. In so speaking, the majority will, in one sense, agree with us. In another they will not; and the differences between Christian majorities and those of the old Hellenic or Egyptian worlds are not wide. To the assertion of those universal thoughts or convictions they will listen approvingly, until they see, or fancy that they see, a disposition to attack through them, and by their aid, the body of technical propositions to which also, they give the name religion. If any real ground should be furnished for this suspicion, the speakers will soon be informed that their primitive and natural religion is altogether insufficient; that religion cannot exist apart from its historical framework; that of the events with which it is bound up, some are truths as well as facts; and that the reality of this framework is vouched for by a long series of marvellous incidents recorded in, or handed down by, ancient traditions.

In truth, we are making no advance so long as we continue in this path. There is no reason to doubt that a wary and careful examination would draw, even from the most bigoted of inquisitors, confessions of a fundamental faith, as simple as that of Eumaios or Nausikaa in the *Odyssey*; and so, if we choose to do so, we may say that in the acknowledgment of these truths all mankind, or, at the least, all civilized men, are agreed. No doubt the same admissions would have been made by the accusers of Socrates. Of this great thinker it may be said that he was fond of using language much in harmony with that of Eumaios; but his words were not accepted by his accusers as covering the whole field of religion, or as furnishing any adequate description of the thing. He might speak of the Divine goodness as that of which mankind were designed to be partakers; but this did not save him from the charges of rejecting the gods worshipped at Athens, and of introducing and setting up in their place new deities of his own.

This state of things can be paralleled in any age; it can be paralleled with singular exactness in our own, and it is important to note how closely the comparison holds good. At Athens, in the time of Socrates, we have, on the one side, a direct and immediate trust in an all-powerful and all-holy God, who is bringing about the good of all His creatures; and, on the other, a system, more or less technical or organized, which challenges acceptance on the ground of an external authority. To both of these we give, or may give, the name of religion; but the adherents of the authoritative or traditional system will assuredly withhold the name from the simpler faith, so soon as they have reason for thinking that the authority

of the traditional system is likely to be impugned. We have before us the same contrasts still. Thinkers who may be disposed to follow the example of Socrates will be apt to say that Christianity and the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount are convertible terms, and that if this be not Christianity as a whole, it is useless to search for it elsewhere. But with such a judgment as this the adherents of traditional schools will have nothing to do. The simple truths, they will say, are undoubtedly truths, and it may be well to insist on them in their proper place ; but their sphere is a very narrow one, and it is the technical system which challenges our obedience at the risk of irretrievable and endless ruin if we question it or reject it. But, briefly, this theory expresses itself in the proposition that what are called the cardinal dogmas or truths of Christianity are also historical events, and therefore that, if any doubt or deny these events, they have no right to the title of Christians, and are in fact traitors and apostates. The statement assumes the form of a dilemma. Either the events on which Christianity is said to rest took place, or Christianity itself is mere falsehood. The reply that the terms used to designate these events are words denoting spiritual and eternal truths or entities, is dismissed with the retort that such fancies are purely visionary and unpractical, and that the average of mankind are wholly incapable of rising to such intellectual heights as these. That the traditional apologists have an immense advantage in their organization, in the completeness of their system, and in their numbers, there can be no question ; and the same facts confront us in the trial and condemnation of Socrates.

For practical purposes it is, therefore, useless to define religion as a confession of certain primary truths, in reference to which all mankind, or all civilized mankind, are agreed. Whatever it may be in itself, we must make the term include all the acts, observances, and ceremonies by which any body, or bodies, of men choose to approach, or think that they approach, certain unseen beings with whom they suppose themselves to have a certain relation. These usages may, or may not, imply the reality of particular incidents in the history of the past. They most assuredly will do so when the system has acquired wide acceptance and authority ; but we may, perhaps, be able to go back beyond them to a time when such historical beliefs were still things of the future. We can do so to a large extent with both the Greek and the Latin tribes of the ancient world. As we approach the time of contemporary historians, we find that these tribes have reached highly complicated social conditions which it is as necessary as it is difficult for us to understand ; and these conditions are essentially religious.

In the Hellenic world we find everywhere the *polis*, or city, as the final unit of society ; but the *polis* is merely the result of an aggregation of tribes (*phylai*), and the tribes again spring simply from a union of *phratritiai*, or clans, which, in their turn, represent gatherings of houses or families, the Greek *γένος*, the Latin *gens*. We find that all these, in-

cluding the *polis*, are religious societies, and that the subordinate fellowships are religious with an intensity scarcely to us conceivable. Into the *polis* other elements have entered, counteracting some of the principles which have full play in the tribes, the clans, and therefore, of course, still more in the house or family. It is, then, on the primeval Greek house that we have to fix our attention, if we wish to trace the forms and see the full significance of the religion, or, it may be, religions, which established themselves in the Hellenic world. We must take the facts as they come before us, not venturing to reduce them to a consistency for the proof of which we may lack adequate evidence, and not forgetting that the religion of one Greek *polis*, or city, might differ indefinitely from the religion of any other.

We are quite safe in saying that, the further we go back, the more we see before us a picture of savage and fierce exclusiveness, and that the various stages in the development of the *polis* show the check and curb put on the more brutal instincts which mark the life of the primitive Greek or Latin family. The growth of the *polis*, therefore, means the handling of materials which yielded for the most part a stubborn resistance. In other words, the materials out of which States have been formed are not those which the State would have desired as the most suitable instruments for doing its work. Thus the house carries us back to a time when we may fairly say that the influence or existence of any religion is scarcely discernible; and we have to ask how the family life of Greeks or Latins came to assume forms which seemed to place an impassable barrier in the way of the development of the State, and also of the elaborate and complicated systems of later religions. In examining the earlier conditions of human society, historians and political economists have been apt to put effects for causes; and this is just what we do when we say that in the ancient world community of place could no more convert aliens into citizens, than it could change domestic beasts into men; that in it property was derived from political rights, and not political rights from property. But why should it be so? and how are these difficulties explained by saying that particular races worshipped particular gods, and in a particular manner, when the very point which we have to determine is why these things should be so? We are told that in the ancient society the mixture of persons of different race in the same commonwealth tended to confuse all the relations of life, and all men's notions of right and wrong. But what we wish to know, and what we must know, is how or why notions of right and wrong, liable to be so disturbed, should have come into existence. What was the reason for that prohibition of inter-marriage, which we are told was a fatal hindrance to the development of national life? Why was an Athenian citizen an alien on reaching Corinth, although he was not a foreigner? Whence came the *patria potestas* of the old Roman law, which was unquestionably the power of life and death, residing in the master or lord, over all the members of the family? Why should exile

have been regarded as an adequate recompense for the crimes of the worst offenders?

The explanation is, after all, a simple one. The original Hellenic or Latin house was strictly what the den is to the wild beast which dwells in it,—something, namely, to which he only has a right, and which his mate and offspring share by his sufferance, but which nothing else may enter except at the risk of life. This utter isolation of the earlier home is conclusively proved by social conditions, which we find existing in historical times. It could not have acquired its inviolable religious character had it not been held as a stronghold of the family long before the religious sanction came to be recognised and enforced. Among the Greek, as among the Latin tribes, every house was a fortress, carefully cut off by its precinct from every other. No party walls might join together the possessions of different families; no plough might break the neutral ground which left each abode in impenetrable seclusion. The curse attached to the removal of a neighbour's landmark was itself the growth of a later age which had begun to invest with the sanction of law the savage instinct which in earlier times had trusted to mere brute force; and in its turn the special boundary-god of each household gave place to a common deity which guarded the boundaries of the whole community. But the Latin myth is careful to tell us that the Roman Terminus was a power too mighty to be assailed even by the Capitoline Jupiter; and in this tale we have the evidence that the notion, of which Terminus was the embodiment, was far older than the religion of which Jupiter, Zeus-Patēr, the All-father, was the necessary expression. The conception of Zeus Herkeios and Zeus Ephestios, who guard the fences and the hearth of a house, is, therefore, also older than that of Zeus the Father; and these two deities are, in fact, generalizations for a multitude of deities who presided each over his own scanty domain, the representatives of the isolated being who had once guarded his den against all invaders. From this condition of life there would have been no emerging had the impulse not been given by what we must call the growth of religion. The impulse came from the belief in the continuity of human life. It is useless to ask if this belief existed from the first. Of actual origins, it must be freely confessed that we know nothing. All that we can say is, that when we look on the pictures of ancient life, so far as we can trace them, the belief is there; and according to this belief the owner of the den had not ceased to live because he was dead. He felt the wants, the pleasures, and the pains of his former life. His rights of property were in no way changed, while his power to do harm (if he chose to do harm) was greater than it had been. He was not less the lord of his house, and he had the further title to reverence that he was now the object of its worship, its god. The result would be a development of the horrid rites which accompanied what we term Chthonian worship. As he would still need to hunt, to eat, and to sleep, his horse, his cook, and his wife must be despatched to bear him company in the

unseen world. He must be clothed, and therefore the costliest raiment must be offered to him, and consumed by fire, as in the Herodotean story of Periander and Melissa. The religious foundation being thus firmly laid, the superstructure soon assumed the form of a systematic and well-ordered fabric. If the departed spirit cannot obtain the rest which it needs, it will wreak its vengeance on the living. But it cannot rest if the body remain unburied; and this last office can be performed only by the dead man's legitimate representative—in other words, by his eldest son, born in wedlock of a woman initiated into the family religion. Thus, as the generations went on, the living master of the house ruled simply as the vicegerent of the man from whom he had inherited his authority; that is, he ruled strictly by virtue of a religious sanction, which set at defiance the promptings and impulses of natural affection. His wife was his slave; his sons, though they might be fathers of children, were absolutely in his power; nor could his death bring them freedom, for then they became the subjects of their elder brother. It follows that the master of each household was both its priest and its king. He alone could offer the sacrifices before the sacred hearth; and in the worship, which he only could conduct, no one who was not a member of the family could take part, as the lion's cubs alone could have the right of sharing the lion's den. The intrusion of a stranger was profanation; his touch in the act of worship was pollution. But just as the welfare and repose of the dead depended on the continuity of the family, so for the father of the family, and then for all its members, marriage became a duty. If the natural succession failed, the remedy lay in adoption; but this adoption was effected by a religious ceremony of the most solemn kind. The subject of it renounced his own family and the worship of its gods, to pass to another hearth and to the worship of other deities.

The impulse which had given the religious sanction to the family could not, however, stop short here indefinitely. As serving only the gods of his own recesses, the master, father, or priest, could know nothing of the ritual of any family but his own; nor would he acknowledge any religion linking him with any beyond the limits of his own household. But these limits were extended, necessarily, with each generation, the younger sons becoming the heads of new families, which were kept in strict subordination to the chief, who in a direct line represented the original progenitor. The latter thus became the king of a number of houses or a clan. The same blood must flow, or be thought to flow, through the veins of every member of these houses, and they must worship the same gods with the same ceremonies. All who could not satisfy these conditions were aliens or enemies, for the two words were synonymous; and so we see in the East the religious growth of caste, in the West the rise of a *plebs* or *clientèle*; and beneath these might be placed the serf, the helot, or the slave. But the plebeian, not less than the slave, was separated from the patrician by a gulf both morally and physically impassable; and thus we have before us a condition

of society in which the distinction of orders was based absolutely on religion. In other words, a bitter sting was imparted to the differences which separate man from man; and when men so separated from the patrician or ruling houses were brought together within the limits of the same community, there followed first an eupatrid ascendancy based on theories of unapproachable superiority, and then the long conflicts which led ultimately to the ruin of Athens, and to struggles which for a time appeared not less hopeless at Rome. Both at Athens and at Rome the admission of any but patricians to offices of state was regarded as sacrilege, as a direct insult to the majesty of the gods. The efforts of what we call the liberal statesmen of Athens or of Rome were simply directed to the throwing down of the religious barriers designed to keep the non-patrician classes under the heel of those who claimed an inalienable sovereignty. These chiefs or nobles could conceive of no society without the special sanction which their own priesthood could alone impart to it. If any others should be allowed to offer these sacrifices, and on the strength of this privilege to share their powers or their honours, this would be not so much a political movement, which might destroy the *polis*, as a profanation for which no atonement was possible. Step by step were these religious barriers assailed, and inch by inch were the points at issue conceded to the men who were looked upon as made of commoner clay than the members of the eupatrid houses.

Progress, or at the least change, there must be in all earthly things; but the conditions of the early Greek household compelled the eupatrid to set his face against all change except in one direction. For the master of one den with its dependencies there could be no alteration of circumstances except by alliance with the master of another class; and such alliances it would in course of time be impossible to avoid. Thus would be formed a eupatrid body, each family deriving its title to its indefectible religious ascendancy from the founder, who by his death had become its god. The families thus united were committed to an absolute exclusiveness which treated the rest of mankind as the dirt beneath their feet. The gulf between them could never be passed. The stranger remained a stranger for ever. The members of the old Hellenic tribes were beyond doubt closely connected by ties of kindred as by their speech, their habits, their laws, their tastes, and their occupations. Yet out of the bounds of his own city each was an alien who had no proper claim to the protection of the laws, who could not become an owner of land in a soil sacred to the worship of gods not his own, and who could not inherit from the citizens, because all inheritance implied the maintenance of a particular ritual, and this maintenance depended strictly upon blood. Only in his own state then (and his state was strictly the city) could he live under the protection of law, that is, of religion. Anywhere else he must lead, in literal strictness of speech, an utterly godless life. Hence the sentence of banishment became a punishment more terrible than that of death, for the

banished man was wiped out from his family and from the worship of the family gods. He was no longer husband or father, and his kinsfolk were free to act as though he had never lived.

We have now no difficulty in seeing the political results of such a religious system as this. The family might in the course of a dozen generations spread out into a clan; the alliance of clans might lead to the formation of tribes, and the aggregation of tribes might constitute a city; but here the course of natural development would end. The eupatrid would never risk the loss of his religious pre-eminence by admitting non-eupatrids to share his privileges in the state; and the true Greek city was one in which those only were citizens who could produce the eupatrid title. So far as they departed from this type, they were betraying the majesty of the gods and profaning their worship. In only one Greek city perhaps, can it be said that this type was deliberately cast aside, and that another theory was consciously or unconsciously embraced which, if unhindered, could not fail to scatter the old exclusiveness to the winds. Such a development was begun at Athens, and if it had not been arrested it would have altered the history of the world. A Greek nation never existed; but Athens set out on a path which led logically to such a growth, and the formation of her maritime confederacy was a step of vital importance in this direction. It was instinctively felt to be so by the other cities for whom, apart from eupatrid and oligarchic privilege, life was not worth living. It was this great question which brought about the Peloponnesian war; and it was the triumph of the adherents of the old religion which led first to the ascendancy of the Macedonian kings and then to the supremacy of Rome.

Here, then, we have a religion of a very practical sort, which made the isolation of classes a matter of faith and denounced the commingling of them as blasphemy, which fostered feelings of suspicion and dislike between the members of different states even in times of peace, and intensified indefinitely all the horrors of war. Each war became, in fact, a crusade, and the conqueror had the unquestioned right to slay all whom he vanquished. If he failed to exercise this right, it was only because he preferred to make a profit out of them by selling or keeping them as slaves. If he made terms with the enemy, the compact went for nothing if any technical error occurred in the ritual which ratified them. The Roman never accused himself of treachery in his treatment of the Samnites after the disaster of the Caudine Forks. The treaty had not been hallowed by the blood of a victim, and it was useless to appeal to the good faith of honourable men. The conscience lay asleep under the burden of technicalities. But the very fact of the expansion of the house into the clan, of the clan into the tribe, and of the tribe into the city put limitations, more or less sensibly felt, on the principle of absolute isolation on which the life of the family had been founded. With the constitution of the State a new set of influences were brought into play; but the State at first could do no

more than modify the rules of the old family life to suit its own purposes and to work out its ends by means of compromise. No temptation was felt for a long time to question principles which had their sanction from religion. To propose that one house should abandon its worship and adopt that of another house in its stead, would have been at once an act of impiety and of madness. But it might be, and it was, possible to induce a number of houses to unite in the common worship of a god whom they jointly chose as their protector; and these societies became thus grouped in a society capable of indefinite expansion. In this union no change was made in the character of the houses themselves. All that was done was to provide a common ground on which certain families might meet to promote their secular interests. Their morality continued to be what it had been—the fruit of a religious belief which touched neither the heart nor the conscience. Its good points were due to the necessities of the primitive family life, not to conscious perception of the distinctions between moral right and moral wrong. It guarded carefully the chastity of the matron of the house; but it did so because the violation of it would render the worship of its gods a mockery. The qualities which it fostered had their root not in any spontaneous feeling or instinct, but simply in a technical discipline. In no direction could the member of an ancient household turn himself without being confronted by external restraints. The doing or not doing of certain acts depended not on the sense which told them that the one was right and the other wrong, but on the fact that a wolf or a rabbit had crossed their path, or that they had heard a crow chatter, or seen the lightning flash on one side rather than the other. Their only idea of the gods whom they worshipped, that is, of their own ancestors, was that of beings who retained their human appetites while they had acquired superhuman power and perhaps superhuman malignity. The intolerance, harshness, and cruelty which lay at the root of the old family life were not, of course, confined to any one country. These principles may be traced in every Aryan land; and all that can be said is that if a comparison of Greeks with Romans be to the advantage of the former, it is at the cost of those qualities which made the Roman the master of the world. In both alike we see the same hard and un pitying character; in both we can trace this result to a religion which proscribed all human sympathy, which was founded on fear, and had its natural fruit in exclusiveness and cruelty.

The development of the phratría had not, and was not intended to have, any effect on the religious character of the houses. Rather, the constitution of the phratría was not less directly religious than that of the family. Each house retained its own altar and its own worship, and each phratry or group of families had a common altar erected in honour of a common deity who was supposed to be more powerful than the deities of the households taken separately. The larger societies which grew out of the union of phratries had each its own territory, the fields in which each family

had its burying place, with the common ground which lay between the several landmarks; but the principle of these combinations was essentially not local, and so the dependents of those houses could never acquire interest or possession in the soil on which they lived, laboured, and died. At best they might be suffered to retain a certain portion of the produce on condition of paying the rest to their lord, failure in this payment being followed by their reduction to personal slavery.

The primitive religion of the Greek tribes is thus seen to be an instrument of enormous power, regulating the whole life of every member of the Greek household, and affecting the subsequent political history of all the Hellenic cities. It placed a seemingly impassable barrier at the first even between one family and another, and suffered only by compromise the union of houses in the clan. It shut off these dominant houses from all other inhabitants of the land as from things common and unclean, and made slavery the inevitable doom of the conquered. Acts and ceremonies which may seem to us purely political had for them at first a merely religious meaning. The object of the Roman census was not to ascertain the number of the citizens, but to insure first the attendance of every citizen at the lustration, which was to atone for all previous shortcomings in the service of the gods, and, still more, to guard against the intrusion of strangers whose presence would deprive that lustration of all its efficacy. Without a knowledge of the will of the gods, obtained by auguries or omens, or in any other way, no operations of war could be undertaken; nor even in a time of actual war could any battle be begun until the signs from the victims slain were declared to be satisfactory. As religion gave to the father or lord of the house his authority and power, so the king, who came into existence after families had been grouped in clans and clans in tribes, was consecrated as the representative of the master or progenitor, while all other magistrates reflected the authority of the king.

The working of the earliest form of Greek religion is thus seen with sufficient clearness; and thus far it comes before us as a religion without a mythology. That it possessed not even the germs of a mythology, it would be rash to affirm. How soon the sayings out of which myths grew may have gathered round the names of the founders of these houses, we cannot say. The historian Hekataios declared that he could trace back his own genealogy in the sixteenth degree to a god; and there is no reason for supposing that he looked upon himself as Diogenes or Zeus-born. We may conclude, therefore, that by the god he meant the deified progenitor of his house; but his words would imply that the interval which separated him from that progenitor was one which covered the greater part of a millennium; and no such long period is needed for even the full development of mythological systems. It is certain, however, that when the primitive Hellenic religion comes before us in a later stage, it is seen to be connected with a rich growth of mythical stories. In no other way could the higher forms of Greek thought, life, and art have been brought into being.

Religion in its earlier form had led in some sort to the constitution of a *polis* or city ; and at this point it left them, we may say, stranded. It laid down as a vital principle the distinction between eupatrids and all the rest of mankind. It denounced as profanation or impiety the admission of non-eupatrids to a share in the work of government ; and it raised its voice against any principles or theories which might tend to group cities under another city, as families were grouped into clans and clans into tribes. The way to all that we understand by national union was thus effectually barred ; and if the lesson had been learnt with the same completeness at Athens as in other Greek cities, the subsequent history of Athens would have exhibited only the intellectual stagnation of Sparta. But the lesson was learnt only in part. The attempt to set aside the distinctions set up by the eupatrids (or oligarchs, as they also came to be called) was soon made ; and happily there were other means by which the fellowship interdicted in one direction was realized, to whatever extent, in another. To the very idea of national union their eyes were utterly blind, and even statesmen so far-sighted as Themistocles and Pericles worked rather in obedience to a political instinct than from any distinct consciousness of the logical results to which their action, if unchecked, must lead. They could see that the formation of the Delian confederacy must place Athens at the head of a multitude of Hellenic cities ; but they had no means of convincing the Hellenic cities that Athens would not on that account be depriving them of anything which deserved the name of freedom, justice, or law.

Progress in this direction, then, was hopeless ; but the longing for union of some sort could not be repressed in the same off-hand fashion. Much as they might dislike or fear each other politically, Spartans, Corinthians, Athenians and Argives still knew that they were Hellenes, and took pride in the fact. Knowing also that Persians, Phenicians, and Gauls were not Hellenes, they were ready to acknowledge their kinship with each other while they looked upon the rest of mankind as barbarians, that is, as speakers of unintelligible languages. The bond of speech, therefore, was one influence which counteracted the centrifugal tendencies of Greek political or religious feeling ; and with this there was also a certain Hellenic character which may be broadly described as national. It failed to combine the Hellenic tribes into a nation, and the distinctions involved in it faded off in some cases (as with Etolians and Acarnanians) into shades scarcely discernible ; but it was nevertheless easy to see that the Persian character and the oriental character generally was one thing, and that the Hellenic character was another. To the Persian the human body was a thing which might be mutilated or insulted at his will, deprived of its manhood, disgraced by servile prostrations, and offered up in sacrifice to malignant and bloodthirsty deities. Knowing nothing of these abominable usages, the Greek rejoiced to look upon the beauty and vigour of the unclothed body ; and the exhibition of this form in games of strength

and skill became, through the great festivals of the separate or collected tribes, bound up intimately with his religion. It is on these points of marked contrast that the Spartan as well as the Athenian would have fixed his mind on being asked to what race he belonged. In their games, as well as in the temples which grew up where those games were instituted, the Greeks had a ground of fellowship which they could have obtained in no other way; and the guardianship of those temples furnished yet another bond of religious, if not national, union. Of these great games or festivals some were, like the gatherings of Delos, limited to a certain section of the Greek world; to others, as to the Olympian, all might claim admission who could establish their right to bear the Hellenic name.

But when we come to these festivals, we find ourselves in a system in which religion and mythology are inseparably blended,—nay, rather, in which the mythology is the religion. The gathering at Delos was strictly in honour of the sun-god Phœbus Apollon, and the worshippers were his children. The growth of the myth, or rather of myths, is exhibited in the so-called Homeric Hymn to Apollon. At first sight this hymn might be taken as a song in honour of the Delian god and his Delian shrine only. In reality a few lines are all that we have about Delos. The rest of the hymn must have been composed generations or ages later by some Delphian when the Parnassian temple had risen to pre-eminent greatness. In both cases the story speaks for itself. We see before us the deity for whom it is as impossible to remain in his birthplace as it is impossible for him not to return to it. We are looking at the daily journey of the sun. Every detail heightens the force of the picture. The joy of Lêtô is mingled with fear. She knew that the unborn child would be a being of mighty power, and she dreaded lest he should despise his rocky and barren birthplace and spurn it with his foot into the sea. It remained only for her to make a solemn covenant with Delos that here should be the sanctuary of her child for ever. She is then described as casting her arms round a palm tree as she reclined on the bank of Kynthos, and the babe leaped to life and light as the earth smiled around her. The nymphs bathed him in pure water, and wrapping him in a glistening robe, fine and newly-wrought, placed a golden band round the body of Chrysâôr, the lord of the golden sword, while Thetis touched his lips with the food and the drink of the gods. No sooner had the child received this nourishment than, like Vishnu in his dwarf-incarnation as Hari, he was endowed with an irresistible strength, and his swaddling bands fell off from him like flax, as he declared his mission of teaching to men the counsels of Zeus. Then began, we are told, the journey of the far-shooting god, whose golden hair no razor should ever touch. From land to land he went, delighting his eyes with the beautiful sights of grove-clad hills and waters running to the sea. The historical interest of this hymn lies in the fact that it points to a time when this festival at Delos was celebrated with a magnificence which the Lydian and Persian conquests grievously impaired. To the first hymn-writer

Delos is the abode dear above all others to the lord of light; and thither came worshippers whose beauty and vigour would seem to be beyond the touch of sickness, pain, or death. But for all this, in Delos, as the hymn-writer is well aware, the sun-god cannot stay. All that he can say is that he never fails to return to it with ever fresh delight. But for both the hymn-writers all the incidents attending his birth and, again, his journey from Delos to Pytho or Delphi were matters of veritable history; and this conviction became intensified in the legends, which became for the several Hellenic tribes or cities the charter of their title to the old Hellenic name, Argives, Athenians, Thebans, Megarians, all had a grave story to tell, and each told it with a profound assurance of its truth as historical fact. On the eve of the battle of Phthia the men of Tegea appealed seriously to the exploits of their forefathers in the days of Echemos and Hyllos, and the Athenians could parry their claims only by appealing to better deeds done by Athenians at the same time.

We may take a few of these tribal stories. That of the Argives recounted the deeds of Perseus, who, as the child of the golden shower, is one of the many virgin-born deities and heroes of the ancient Greek, or rather Aryan, world, and who, with the sword of the Chrysâor in his hand and the sandals of the nymphs on his feet, journeyed away to the land of the gloaming, and there by a stroke of his weapon brought to an end the woes of the mortal Gorgon. For the Argive all this was sober historical narrative. Of the deliverance which Perseus wrought for Andromeda, of his vengeance on Phineus and Polydektes, and of his triumphant return to his ancient home to work out the doom of Akrisios, he could suffer no man to breathe a doubt. With not less confidence the Theban told the story of Laios and Oidipous from the day when the babe was cast forth to frost and heat on the slopes of Kithairon to the hour when, after the discomfiture of the Sphinx and his unwitting offence against the sanctities of law, the blinded man departed on the wanderings which were to end in the holy grave of the Erinyes. The Megarian in his turn told of the marvellous power which lay in the purple locks of King Nisos and how for love of the Cretan Minos Skylla robbed the city of its safeguard, and brought on herself the due reward of her treachery. The Athenian, with greater pride, could speak of his dragon-kings Kekrops and Erechtheus, of the sorrows of Prokris, and the wrongs done to the beautiful Aithra, and dwell on the career of the child Theseus—how, on reaching the fulness of manhood, he raised the great stone, and taking in his hand the sword of destiny, proved, like the Arthur of later romance, that he was “right wise born a king,”—how he cast in his lot with the doomed tribute-children, and, sailing to Crete, trod the mazes of the labyrinth and slew the Minotauros. The Eolian legend, telling of the impious presumption which drew down on Salomeus the doom of Tullus Hostilius in the Roman story, related also how his daughter Tyro was won by Zeus Poseidon on the banks of the Enipeus and became the mother of Dioskouroi, Pelias

and Neleus,—how these her children, saved from death like Cyrus, Romulus and Remus, rescued her from the cruelty of the iron-hearted Sidêro,—how Pelias reigned in Theessaly, and Neleus made for himself a kingdom in Pylos,—how by the aid of Melampous Bias obtained as his wife the beautiful Pero, the daughter of Neleus,—how, when his other sons had been slain by Herakles, Nestor still remained to recount his exploits against the Kentaurs and the Lapithai,—and how his descendants going to Athens ruled there as kings until Kodros shed on the royal name so great a lustre that none henceforth was suffered to bear the title. But the great Eolian race included also the lines of Kretheus, Sisyphos, and Athamas; and each of these had its own ancestral glories. The name of Admetos, the grandson of Kretheus, is linked with that of the beautiful Alkestis and the story of her death and resurrection, while in the fortunes of his kinsman Iason the legend passes into that mighty stream of mythical history which widens into an ocean in the tale of the war for Helen before Troy. Another branch of the same race looked back to Sisyphos, whose exploits or whose crimes doomed him to endless toil with the rolling stone, while the traditions of the house of Athamas told the tale of Phrixos and Helle, and thus touched the Pan-Hellenic myth of the Argonautic expedition. So for the Cretan the mythical greatness of Minos was evidence that the empire of Crete had once reckoned Athens and Megara amongst its subject cities.

The serene confidence felt by the several tribes or races thus far mentioned in the historical trustworthiness of their narratives is a fact as wonderful as it is important. We may speak of the conclusion as fully proved that the political legends of Athenians, Thebans, Thessalians, Spartans, Argives, move in the same charmed circle and revolve more or less closely round the same magic point,—this centre being the birth, the wanderings, the death, the uprising of the lord of life and light, the daily and yearly career of the sun. A comparison of these with other myths has established not only the closest possible connexion between them, but has shown that Perseus, Bellerophon, Theseus, Kephalos, Herakles, and Apollon are merely different forms suggested by the varying aspects and features of the great central figure of the sun from which they all spring. We may be perhaps astonished at the seeming variety of action and incident in these stories; but in each and all of them the recurrence of the same imagery, freshened by ingenious modifications, and always with new and often singularly true local colouring, is not less remarkable. The very names occurring in these religious legends have a significance which the Greek language itself interprets, whenever they tell us of the great heroes whose lives run in the same magic groove. To take a single instance, when the genealogy of Phthia is to be mingled with that of Elis, it is Protogeneia (the earliest dawn) who becomes the mother of Aethlios (the toiling and struggling sun), who is the father of Endymion (the tired sun at his setting), in whose child Eurydike we see again the morrow's light restored to its former brightness.

II.

The picture which has been drawn of the primitive religion of the Greek eupatrid houses is one which applies equally to that of the Latin or Roman family or household. It is the picture of a religion which regulated the whole life of every member of the household, and surrounded him as effectually as the air which he breathed, saturating him with principles of fierce intolerance, exclusiveness and hatred. But it is a religion which seems to have been able to dispense with a mythology, or which at all events furnished no materials for the growth of myths, until the clans and tribes had coalesced into independent cities. Thus we have seen that the citizens of the several States so formed had each made up a record of the fortunes of their forefathers, and that these traditions were supposed to belong exclusively to each city. This belief we have seen to be from beginning to end a delusion. The stories, taken as a body, are practically nothing more than different versions of one and the same myth, which portrays the varying aspects of the outward world and the action of the sun in and upon that world during the day and throughout the year.

Here we may note two things: (1) that these legends or tales supplied for the members of the different tribes a religion decidedly higher and better than the unmythological faith of the original eupatrid despots, and (2) that these mythical traditions come from a source which was practically inexhaustible. The Greek or Latin of prehistoric times described, or tried to describe, all that he saw, all that he could feel or touch or taste or hear; and so long as he and they who were about him knew the meaning of the words which they were using, there could be no room for misunderstanding or misapprehension. In other words, the conditions needed for the growth of myths would not be present. As time went on and the meaning of the words used became indistinct or was forgotten, names of things became gradually the names of persons, and the words which described the changes of the outward world now described the actions of beings conscious of their purpose and their work. It must not, indeed, be forgotten that mankind had never, and have never, been able to reach an abstract conception except through pictures of thoroughly sensuous imagery; and thus all words expressing general ideas have originally denoted nothing more than impressions made on the mind by sensible phenomena. Of this outward world they could, of course, speak only as they thought; and they would speak truly of anything that came within the range of their senses. The sun might be the most prominent of all the objects which could meet their eyes; but it is absurd to suppose that they could never speak of anything else. Winds, seas, streams, clouds, mountains, storm, tempest, light, darkness, trees and flowers, beasts and birds, would become matters of thought, and would furnish the groundwork for myths which merely expressed the mind of the untaught and untrained man. From the influence of this language it would be impossible for him to escape;

and on the whole there is little reason for regretting that he could not escape from it. The early descriptions of physical phenomena have become vehicles for expressing some of the highest and purest conceptions to which the human mind has been able to rise. The Hellenic or Latin tribes may have been more or less conscious that when they spoke of the great Maker of all things and Father of all men, they spoke of Him under names which denoted originally nothing more than the bright heaven which could never be sullied by clouds and darkness; but in this respect we even now stand at no great advantage. Two centuries ago Locke expressed his suspicion that "if we could trace them to their sources, we should find in all languages the names which stand for things that fall out under our senses to have had their first rise from sensible ideas." The analysis of language since Locke's day has proved the truth of his words to demonstration. God, heaven, truth, mercy, righteousness, love, are terms which have been suggested directly by objects of sense, and to contend that it is not so is a mere useless kicking against the pricks. We speak of the souls of men as of something altogether distinct from the world of phenomena; yet soul is simply a name denoting the restlessness of the heaving and surging sea, which reflects heaven and earth in its mirror.

The myths which grew up from the impressions thus derived by the senses from the outward world grew up into something like a coherent system, which was held to regulate the course of human life and duty from the cradle to the grave, and the destinies of men after death; and this system was accepted with a faith as unquestioning as that which has been accorded to any of the traditional beliefs and theories of Christendom. Both alike have professed to deal with the spiritual world. Both have declared that the spiritual truths could not be held apart from the supposed historical framework for which the outward world had furnished the materials. Whether the framework be, or be not, in both cases the same, is a question which cannot be evaded, and which sooner or later must be answered. The process which has led to these results may be clearly traced in those articles of ancient belief which affected most closely the moral and religious life of those who held it. For the Hellenic as well as for the Latin tribes the supreme Maker of all things and Father of all men was Zeus, under the compound form Zeus Patēr, or Jupiter, the Dyaus-pitar of the Hindu. For all of them the name Dyaus had denoted at the first only the bright shining heaven, raised above the gross thick air through which the clouds course and in which the winds work their will. Hence in the earlier terms of the myth Zeus can never descend from his high abode to take part in the struggles and conflicts of men; and so when the hour for the battle between Achilles and Hector is come, Zeus is represented as telling the gods, the streams, and the nymphs who sit round his throne, that they may go down and choose each his side, but that he himself can only look from Olympus on the fortunes of the men for whom nevertheless he cares. It is true that in the Vedic hymns Dyaus (Zeus)

is displaced by Varuna and by Indra; but Indra was himself worshipped as the god of the bright sky and the son of the brilliant Dyu. Still the word Dyu, Dyaus, Zeus, could not become a personal name until its original meaning had been obscured. The Greek had his *Aēr*, his *Aithēr* (ether), and his *Ouranos* to express the visible heavens; and Zeus became to him more and more the personal god whose hand is seen in his works. But in the West as in the East the original character of the god is in close accordance with the etymology of the word. The Athenians called on Zeus to rain on their land; the Latins spoke of the glistening heaven which by all is named Jove, while the phrases *sub dīo vivere*, *sub Jove frigido*, and even *malus Jupiter*, remained common expressions in everyday speech. But in the conception of Zeus generally the two streams of religion and myth ran side by side with singular distinctness. Nowhere is this conclusion so forced upon us as in the Hesiodic *Works and Days*. This may, or may not be, a single poem. In all likelihood it is a combination of two or more; but the matter is of subordinate importance. At all events, we have in the compass of a very small book two distinct streams of thought. In the one the poet bids his friend deal with all men after the rule of righteousness which comes from Zeus; tells him that justice and truth shall in the end prevail, and that they who do evil to others inflict evil on themselves; and warns him that the eyes of God are in every place, that the way of evil is broad and smooth, and the path of good narrow and rough at the first. This is followed by the story of Pandora; and the poet, who can scarcely be the poet of the former part, relates how Zeus bade the gods make her fair to look upon, but all evil within, and laughed at the thought of the miseries which should overtake mankind when the evils shut up in her box should be let loose, while, to crush them utterly, hope should be left a prisoner within it. It is not easy to suppose that the poet who speaks of Zeus as cheating and laughing at mankind is consciously speaking of the same Zeus who bids them to do justice and love mercy as he himself is just and merciful.

In this latter aspect Zeus is a righteous god; and therefore, as seeing from his throne in heaven all that is done on earth, he must be the impartial judge who punishes all iniquity. But while we have clear assertions of human responsibility to the unseen but all-seeing Father, the mythical or sensuous origin of the conception is constantly thrusting itself upon us. The punishments which he inflicts on Tantalus or Ixion, on Lykaon and Sisyphos, are involved in the very idea of these beings. The sun, as rising into the dizzy heights of heaven, may be said to gaze too boldly on the bride of Zeus; but his downward course is not less certain than his ascent, and at midday he must be fastened or crucified like Ixion on his four-spoked wheel, while the ball which Sisyphos has with huge toil rolled to the mountain-summit (the zenith) must slip from his grasp and dash down again into the valley below. Still more must he punish any insults done to him as lord of the fire-laden thunder-clouds; and Prometheus, as teaching man how to kindle

a flame and cheat the gods with offerings of fat and bone, is an offender less easily pardoned than chiefs who sacrifice their children on his altars.

The story of Prometheus brings us to a series of myths or legends which directly contradict each other; but by the average Greek these contradictions seem to have been unnoticed. The records of sacred books are now, as then, received none the less readily and trustfully, because their statements may even exclude each other. They who can read St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians without perceiving that in every particular it contradicts and sets aside the narratives of the Acts of the Apostles will never be troubled by inconsistencies scarcely so obtrusive in the traditions of old Greeks or Romans. According to the Hesiodic theogony the existence of men upon earth began (after the notion prevalent in Christian traditionalism) with a golden age, during which the earth yielded her fruits of her own accord, and plagues and sickness were unknown. The old Greek myth-makers did not indeed go on to the absurdity of the notion, still popular among Christians, that man was created immortal, the death of, the body being solely and strictly the consequence of his sin. In the Hesiodic golden age men died, but they died as though they were going to sleep, and became the righteous *daimones*, who watch the ways and works of men, to uphold the good and to overturn the wicked. The Hesiodic poets knew of no transitional periods. Each age is virtually a new creation; and the lowering of the successive races is thus deprived of its moral characteristics, the creator being deprived of them also. The earth becomes the accidental abode of a series of degenerating inhabitants, the race of the poet's own day being the worst of all.

In contrast with this gloomier belief, the Promethean myth exhibits mankind in a scale ascending from the savage state, in which they knew the use neither of fire nor of metals, to that high civilization in which Zeus fears that they may become like the gods in wisdom and so share their power. This myth, as related by Æschylus, knows nothing of a previous knowledge of fire which, according to the Hesiodic tale, Zeus took away from man in revenge for the cheat put upon him in the matter of sacrifice. In the Æschylean drama Prometheus expressly speaks of men not as having lost higher powers but as never having been awakened to the consciousness of the faculties with which they were endowed. Till he came to their aid, they were beings to whom sight and hearing were useless, and for whom life presented only the confused images of a dream. The sunless caves, in which they lived like ants, were not wrought into shape by their hands. For them there were no distinctions of seasons, no knowledge of the rising and setting of the stars. For all this misery there was no remedy until men could be brought under the conditions indispensable for the exercise of their powers,—a result to be achieved only by bestowing on them the boon of fire. But this very idea involves the fact that fire was a thing unknown to men upon the earth. They might see it in the cloven thunder-clouds, or tremble at the fiery streams hurled into the air

is displaced by Varuna and by Indra; but Indra was himself worshipped as the god of the bright sky and the son of the brilliant Dyu. Still the word Dyu, Dyaus, Zeus, could not become a personal name until its original meaning had been obscured. The Greek had his *Aër*, his *Aithër* (ether), and his *Ouranos* to express the visible heavens; and Zeus became to him more and more the personal god whose hand is seen in his works. But in the West as in the East the original character of the god is in close accordance with the etymology of the word. The Athenians called on Zeus to rain on their land; the Latins spoke of the glistening heaven which by all is named *Jove*, while the phrases *sub dio vivere*, *sub Jove frigido*, and even *malus Jupiter*, remained common expressions in everyday speech. But in the conception of Zeus generally the two streams of religion and myth ran side by side with singular distinctness. Nowhere is this conclusion so forced upon us as in the Hesiodic *Works and Days*. This may, or may not be, a single poem. In all likelihood it is a combination of two or more; but the matter is of subordinate importance. At all events, we have in the compass of a very small book two distinct streams of thought. In the one the poet bids his friend deal with all men after the rule of righteousness which comes from Zeus; tells him that justice and truth shall in the end prevail, and that they who do evil to others inflict evil on themselves; and warns him that the eyes of God are in every place, that the way of evil is broad and smooth, and the path of good narrow and rough at the first. This is followed by the story of Pandora; and the poet, who can scarcely be the poet of the former part, relates how Zeus bade the gods make her fair to look upon, but all evil within, and laughed at the thought of the miseries which should overtake mankind when the evils shut up in her box should be let loose, while, to crush them utterly, hope should be left a prisoner within it. It is not easy to suppose that the poet who speaks of Zeus as cheating and laughing at mankind is consciously speaking of the same Zeus who bids them to do justice and love mercy as he himself is just and merciful.

In this latter aspect Zeus is a righteous god; and therefore, as seeing from his throne in heaven all that is done on earth, he must be the impartial judge who punishes all iniquity. But while we have clear assertions of human responsibility to the unseen but all-seeing Father, the mythical or sensuous origin of the conception is constantly thrusting itself upon us. The punishments which he inflicts on Tantalus or Ixion, on Lykaon and Sisypheus, are involved in the very idea of these beings. The sun, as rising into the dizzy heights of heaven, may be said to gaze too boldly on the bride of Zeus; but his downward course is not less certain than his ascent, and at midday he must be fastened or crucified like Ixion on his four-spoked wheel, while the ball which Sisypheus has with huge toil rolled to the mountain-summit (the zenith) must slip from his grasp and dash down again into the valley below. Still more must he punish any insults done to him as lord of the fire-laden thunder-clouds; and Prometheus, as teaching man how to kindle

a flame and cheat the gods with offerings of fat and bone, is an offender less easily pardoned than chiefs who sacrifice their children on his altars.

The story of Prometheus brings us to a series of myths or legends which directly contradict each other; but by the average Greek these contradictions seem to have been unnoticed. The records of sacred books are now, as then, received none the less readily and trustfully, because their statements may even exclude each other. They who can read St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians without perceiving that in every particular it contradicts and sets aside the narratives of the Acts of the Apostles will never be troubled by inconsistencies scarcely so obtrusive in the traditions of old Greeks or Romans. According to the Hesiodic theogony the existence of men upon earth began (after the notion prevalent in Christian traditionalism) with a golden age, during which the earth yielded her fruits of her own accord, and plagues and sickness were unknown. The old Greek myth-makers did not indeed go on to the absurdity of the notion, still popular among Christians, that man was created immortal, the death of, the body being solely and strictly the consequence of his sin. In the Hesiodic golden age men died, but they died as though they were going to sleep, and became the righteous *daimones*, who watch the ways and works of men, to uphold the good and to overturn the wicked. The Hesiodic poets knew of no transitional periods. Each age is virtually a new creation; and the lowering of the successive races is thus deprived of its moral characteristics, the creator being deprived of them also. The earth becomes the accidental abode of a series of degenerating inhabitants, the race of the poet's own day being the worst of all.

In contrast with this gloomier belief, the Promethean myth exhibits mankind in a scale ascending from the savage state, in which they knew the use neither of fire nor of metals, to that high civilization in which Zeus fears that they may become like the gods in wisdom and so share their power. This myth, as related by Æschylus, knows nothing of a previous knowledge of fire which, according to the Hesiodic tale, Zeus took away from man in revenge for the cheat put upon him in the matter of sacrifice. In the Æschylean drama Prometheus expressly speaks of men not as having lost higher powers but as never having been awakened to the consciousness of the faculties with which they were endowed. Till he came to their aid, they were beings to whom sight and hearing were useless, and for whom life presented only the confused images of a dream. The sunless caves, in which they lived like ants, were not wrought into shape by their hands. For them there were no distinctions of seasons, no knowledge of the rising and setting of the stars. For all this misery there was no remedy until men could be brought under the conditions indispensable for the exercise of their powers,—a result to be achieved only by bestowing on them the boon of fire. But this very idea involves the fact that fire was a thing unknown to men upon the earth. They might see it in the clefts of thunder-clouds, or tremble at the fiery streams hurled into the air

from the volcanoes ; but to them fire was at the least a thing which they dared not approach with the thought of mastering and turning it to use. Some wiser being than they must, therefore, bring it to them in a form which should make it the servant, not the destroyer, of man. That being was Prometheus, who, by stealing it in a ferule from the palace of Zeus, enables men to cook and to build and to find the wealth stored up within the earth. From him they received skill in the discernment of herbs and roots for the healing of diseases : and from him they learnt also to understand the signs of the calm and the troubled heavens, and the meanings of the muscular movements of victims slain in sacrifice.

In no other way could the great tragic poet have shown more clearly that Prometheus was the friend who bestowed on man, a creature more helpless than any of the brute beasts, all that can make life valuable. Nor can we lay too great a stress on this fact, because this version not only makes the whole myth self-consistent, but it is clearly the earlier form of the legend into which the Hesiodic poet introduced the vengeance taken by Zeus for the cheat put upon him. This story is really a mere piece of patchwork, for according to it men are as far as ever from that state of unawakened powers which is of the very essence of the tale in the tragedy of Æschylus. But how came it about that Prometheus had the power of entering the Olympian palace ? This question Æschylus answers by saying that Prometheus was a Titan, and that when his gigantic kinsfolk rose in rebellion against Zeus, Prometheus played the part of Michael in the war waged within the courts of heaven, the result being that Kronos with his adherents is hurled, like Satan with the revolted angels, into the abyss of Tartaros or hell. But the story goes on to say that Zeus on finding himself securely seated on the throne of heaven, assigned to each god his place and function, but took no count of man, his heart's desire being to sweep the whole race from the earth and to create another, much as Jahveh offers to destroy the Israelites in a moment and to provide a new people who will obey Moses. But this resolution was formed, *not because men were already becoming too wise or powerful, as the Hesiodic version represents the matter, but because man was too mean and wretched a thing to be suffered to cumber the earth.* Here Zeus expresses no fear, and Prometheus is opposed to him not because he is too severe upon enemies whom he dreads, but because he feels no pity for creatures whose wretchedness calls only for compassion. The mercy refused by Zeus is extended to them by Prometheus, who, by stealing the fire, converts the opposition of Zeus into a fierce longing for vengeance against the mighty being who has dared to thwart his will. The great heart whose pulses had beaten in sympathy with the griefs and woes of man shall itself be torn with an agony far surpassing their puny woes. In one point only is the Æschylean story as completely at variance with itself as in all others it is with the Hesiodic myth. These children of men, who are described as being unable either to see or hear, and as clustering

together like ants in their sunless caves until they receive the boon of fire, yet possess a knowledge of things to come and see what is to be the course and close of their lives—and this, before Prometheus brings to them the fire from heaven. This power he takes away from them, substituting blind hopes or dreams in its place; and when he has added to this benefit the gift of fire, he then instructs them in divination, thus supplying in a measure that very knowledge which he had wished to take away and of which he had in fact deprived them.

But the action of the old Hellenic religion was not confined to any one stage of human life. The influence of its deities was exercised before the birth of men and continued after their death. The Eileithyiai watched over the embryo and determined the time when it should begin to breathe the outer air. Without them the child of Lêtô could not leap into light and life at Delos; and by their intervention the worthier man might become the thrall of one meaner than himself. It was thus that Herakles was compelled through life to do the bidding of the vile and crafty Eurystheus. To the care of the Eileithyiai, who ushered the babe into the world, succeeds that of the unseen being whose guardianship is to last through life. In the belief of the Latins the life of the genius or guardian angel seems to have been measured by that of the man assigned to his care. The death of the two must be simultaneous. Nor are these the only beings with whom men are brought into personal relations. There are powers of necessity and of vengeance which even the gods cannot escape from or resist; and the descriptions given of these involve no small inconsistencies and even contradictions. It may be also that, when we get into these regions of Ananke, Moira, Aisa, the Latin Parca or Fatum and the Teutonic Norna, we have to deal with conceptions which belong to a comparatively late stage of thought and which are in fact more or less artificial. With the idea of Ananke, or necessity, is closely linked that of vengeance taken for the shedding of blood, or for offences committed consciously or unconsciously against the majesty of law. There is an irresistible force which drives on the mythical beings who represent the sun and the stars in their courses. The sun himself is united in the evening with the same violet-tinted twilight which greeted his rising and then fled away from him in the morning. But the dawn may with equal truth be spoken of as his mother or as his wife; and though the day may become old and wan, the dawn and the twilight are always fresh. In other words, Oidipous is married to his mother Iokastê, who is as bright and fair as she had ever been. In the imagination of the Greek this awful marriage fills his house with woe and brings his lineage to an end in blood. It is the story of a livid sunset, in which the sun tears out his own eyes and sinks below the earth in loneliness and blindness. Iphigeneia must die in order that Helen may be brought back, just as the expiring twilight must vanish away if the light of dawn is to come again. Must there not then be vengeance taken for the outpouring of her innocent blood? It is a mere impossibility that

Atē should rest till she has visited on Agamemnon himself the death of his guiltless child.

Here, then, we have conceptions, strictly religious or theological, suggested by phrases which described phenomena of the day or the year. The same process goes on everywhere. The moral conflict between Ormuzd and Ahriman points to the earlier physical struggle in which Indra fights with and slays the choking snake who hides away the rain-clouds in his dismal cave; and the battle between spiritual good and evil takes form from the war between the light of the sun and the darkness of the night. The vengeance for iniquity belongs to the fearful Erinyes; but the Erinyes of the *Iliad* is still a winged being who wanders in the air; and Atē has still the tangible form which Zeus hurls from the portals of Olympus. But the Erinyes, who had assumed appalling forms in the West, represented the beautiful Saranyū of the Vedic hymns, whose soft light steals across the heavens, and of whom it was said that she would find out the evil deeds done during the night and punish the wrong-doer. The Greeks called them Eumenides, it was supposed from Euphemism, which ascribed to them qualities of which they were destitute; but they appear in their genuine colours in the story of Oidipous. For him they are merciful and benignant beings in whose grove he may take shelter until it is his time to die. For him they are the weavers who, like Penelope, put together the magic web which is to be undone again during the night. The threads of this web become, in their hands and in those of the Moirai, the lines of human destiny; and when we have said this, we have practically said all. What else is told us of them is little more than allegory, on which the ingenuity of later ages has exercised itself. It was easy to speak of them as daughters of the night, of the earth and darkness. It was easy to name the Erinyes or Eumenides as Allekto, Megaira, and Tisiphone, whose hatred, jealousy, and revenge are unconquerable, and to describe the Moirai as Klotho, who spins the threads of life, Lachesis, who deals them out, and Atropos, who severs them at the moment of death. These in the Latin myth are the Parcæ, and in the Teutonic legend they become Vurdh, Verdhandi, and Skuld, or past, present, and future. Of the same artificial texture are the Litai, whose office as seeking to make amends for wrong done is a mere allegory on the purpose of prayer. What is told us of Nemesis is much of the same sort. In the world good and evil are so capriciously distributed that on one side we have the squalid beggar, on the other the man whose prosperity is so unvarying that his friends, foreseeing the issue, renounce all alliance with him. In either aspect she is Adrasteia, the being from whom there is no escape. After the same fashion Aisa, the spoken word of the Hellenic Zeus, becomes the Fatum of the Latin Jupiter, both being the ministers of the god, not the despotic and irresponsible powers before whom, as before the Ananke of the tragic poets, even Zeus himself must bow.

But these are not the only powers which affect the fortunes of men in

this world and maintain the sanctities of human life. The men amongst whom the great multitude of myths grew up troubled themselves very little about consistency. The believers probably took the myths, as they came separately, and received them all as veritable history. In one tradition the giver of fire to man is, as we have seen, Prometheus; but in the so-called Homeric hymn the gift comes from Hermes. He is so, however, as supplying the materials, not as being, like the Vedic Agni (in Latin *ignis*) himself the fire. The hymn-writer is careful to distinguish between the two. He is the fire-giver because he rubs the branches of the forest together till they burst into a flame; but the wood thus kindled and the meat thus roasted are devoured not by himself but by the fire. Hermes remains hungry, although he is represented as longing for the food whose savour fills his nostrils. Nothing can show more clearly that we are dealing simply with the wind, in other words, with the bellows, not with the fire. But we have yet another discoverer of fire in the Argive Phoroneus, who dwells on the Astu Phoronikon of Argos; and Astu is seemingly only another form of Hestia, the inviolable fire on the sacred hearth,—the only power which placed a curb on the brutish exclusiveness of the primitive eupatrids of the Greek and Latin tribes. Of the origin and character of this exclusiveness enough perhaps has been already said. All that we need mark is that no great accretion of myths was possible in the case either of Phoroneus or of Hestia. The legend, such as it is, belongs to that class of transparent stories among which the myths of Endymion and Sarpedon are the most conspicuous; and the beneficial influence of the cultus of Hestia is most strongly proved by the almost complete absence of myths in connection with her name. She is so clearly the fire on the hearth, the symbol and pledge of good faith, of law and order, that it is impossible to lose sight of her attributes; and the Greek Hestia, even more than the Latin Vesta, remained a name which spoke for itself.

There were yet other myths which tended to impress on men the sense of their responsibility to a law which they could not evade and which they felt to be righteous. The myths, which had started as pictures of sensible phenomena, grew into the religious belief which kept up the idea of human duty, while they appealed to the yearning for happiness,—the end after which all men, in the words of Aristotle, strive and strain. This happiness is especially the lot of those who are admitted into the Elysian paradise. But what is Elysion? Elysion is the golden land far away in the West, where the sun goes down beyond the bounds of the earth; where Eos with her violet tints gladdens the close of the day. The abodes of the blessed are golden islands sailing on a sea of blue, the burnished clouds floating in the pure ether. Grief and sorrow cannot approach them; plagues and sickness cannot touch them; and thus the blissful company gathered together in that far western land inherits, in Pindar's words, a tearless eternity. There is perhaps scarcely a single detail in any one of these pictures which was not suggested directly by images drawn from the phenomena of sunset and

twilight. What spot or stain can be seen on the deep blue ocean in which the islands of the blessed repose for ever? What unseemly forms can mar the beauty of that golden home? Who, then, but the pure in heart, the truthful, and the generous, can be suffered to tread the violet fields? and how shall they be tested save by judges who can discern and weigh the thoughts and intents of the heart? Thus every soul, as it drew near to that joyous land, was brought before the august tribunal of Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Aiakos; and they whose faith was in truth a quickening power might draw from the ordeal those golden lessons which Plato has put into the mouth of Socrates, while waiting the return of the theoric ship from Delos. These, however, are infusions of later thought. The descriptions of the abodes to which the righteous are admitted come straight from the objects of the sensible universe, and they have an importance which is not confined to either ancient Hellenic or ancient Latin traditions. We may take the picture as drawn by Pindar, or by the poets of the *Odyssey*. They all come from the same mint; and this mint is Scheria, the fixed abode of the Phaiakians after their expulsion from Hyperëia. On this home is spread the soft beauty of an everlasting twilight, unsullied by unseemly mists and murky vapours. We need only mark the images chosen by the poet to see how faithfully he adheres to the phenomena of cloud-land. They who have watched in the eastern or western sky the cloud-capped towers, catching the light on their burnished faces, can well feel whence came the surpassing glory of the palace and the gardens of Alkinoos. As we look on the chambers of that splendid dwelling, the brazen walls with their purple bands and string courses, the golden doors and steps of silver, are we not tempted to think that the varying forms and the unsubstantial figures before us are the shapes of living men and beasts who people the shadowy kingdom? Have we not seen there the dogs of gold and silver who guard the house of Alkinoos; the golden youths standing around the inmost shrine with torches in their hands, whose light never dies out; the maidens plying their golden distaffs as their fingers run along the filmy thread spread on the bare ground of the unfading ether? Who does not understand the poet at once when he says that their marvellous skill came from Athēnē, the goddess of the dawn? In truth, there is nothing of earth in this beautiful picture. In the Phaiakian land sorrow and sickness are things unknown; and thus the imagery of the Homeric descriptions is seen to furnish the materials for the hymns which expressed the yearning of mediæval saints for the golden streets and jewelled gates of the heavenly Jerusalem. The language of these hymns might be thought to be borrowed straight from the old Greek poems; but theories of plagiarism are not called for here. The great lyric poet at Olympia and the Christian monk were both reading from the pages of the same book, and the expression of their thoughts must needs correspond with a closeness which may seem to us astonishing. There is no difference between them, except that the Christian poet yearns for the glory which streams from the throne of God the eternal Son.

But it is not the destiny of the good only with which the myth-taught religion of the old Greek tribes professed to deal. For all men the journey through this world came to an end, and all passed into *Anostos*, the region from which no traveller returns. As each crosses the mysterious boundary, he finds himself in the hands of *Hermes*, the *Psychopompos*, or guide of souls, to the abode appointed for them. According to one set of myths, all without exception are conveyed to the realm of *Hades*, who, as *Polydegmon*, has no lack of shelter for all who may be brought to him. But his land is dark, dreary, and repulsive, and existence in its sunless atmosphere is not life; it is but a pretence which has nothing substantial about it. It is even better to be a slave on earth than a prince in this awful region. But it is quite certain that with this gloomy kingdom the *Elysion* of *Pindar* has nothing whatever to do. The dwellers in the *asphodel* meadows, where the corn ripens thrice in the year, need not trouble themselves about the blackness of the abode where *Persephone* spends the months during which the *Mater Dolorosa* seeks her lost child. This is only another sample of the inconsistencies and contradictions between different myths, or sets of myths, of which we have already noticed many instances. It was probably a matter of faith that the righteous were exempt from the penalties inflicted on all who, having crossed the *Styx*, were found to need the discipline. These would be the average of mankind, and those who had run riot in wickedness; and these two classes were consigned to different regions. The former were suffered to dwell in *Hades*; the others were thrust down into the hopeless prisons of the reprobate. The creation of a place of utter darkness for abandoned sinners was a moral or theological, not a mythical, necessity; and hence the mythology of *Tartaros* as a place of torment, is as artificial as that of the *Moirai* or the *Norns*.

Little, however, has been said thus far of the great mythical drama, which for the Hellenic tribes, as for almost all others, was a subject of absorbing interest. Some may say that it is only a mythical drama, and therefore has no necessary connection with Hellenic religion. Yet this argument can scarcely be maintained with seriousness, unless we are to say that the most solemn ceremonies, invested with the full majesty of the state religion, were not religious in any sense whatever. When the Athenian maidens wove the *peplos* for the sacred ship of *Athēnē* in the *Panathenaic* pomp, they were as consciously discharging a religious duty as are the Christian maidens of the orthodox or Latin churches when they deck the images of the virgin mother in the month of May. The object of worship, or veneration, is in each case the same, the difference being only that for the ancient Greek there were many virgin mothers, and each had different children, round whose names were clustered myths or traditions of surpassing interest. For them there were many heroes or deities born in caves; many who were slain and died, to appear again in all their former glory; many who had been tried and tempted without yielding to the seducements of sense; many who had given themselves

absolutely to the work of lessening the troubles, sorrows, follies, and sins of mankind; many who had fought with and beaten down the powers of darkness, and brought courage and hope to those who were dying in weakness and despair. The stories, as we have said, were taken just as they came. No attempts were made (after our fashion with traditional tales) to systematize and harmonize them; and so they exhibit the myth in many stages, some being purely sensuous, others pointing a moral or religious lesson, but none departing altogether from the character which they had at starting. Thus Sarpedon, the chief of Lykia (the land of light), as a representative of the short-lived sun, is smitten down in his youth; but the powers of sleep and death which bear him back to his eastern home point clearly to his starting again with the next dawn on the same journey. In the case of Memnon the myth has not gone so far. He is so transparently the son of Eos, the morning, that he must rise again. Like Zeus on the death of Sarpedon, Eos weeps tears of dew on the death of her child; but her prayers avail to bring him back, like Adonis or Tammuz, from the shadowy land to live always in Olympos. Nay, so clear is the meaning of the story that he is by some called the child of Hemera, the day; and his gleaming armour, like that of Achilles, is wrought by the fire-god Hephaistos.

The ceremonial of the Panathenaic festival brings before us another from of Hellenic and Latin religion, which should either be carefully examined or left alone altogether. It is an intolerable thing to find scholars or theologians affecting ignorance, or purposely slurring over matters which they know to be of vital moment, as in the question, now before us, of what is called tree and serpent worship. The subject is soon stated; and although it was sufficiently systematized among the Greeks and Latins, it would be absurd to suppose that the religion thus brought into shape was peculiar to either. It grew up, independently, everywhere. It was practised in the temple at Jerusalem in spite of the unceasing and vehement protests of the great Hebrew prophets. There every year, at the time of the winter solstice, the women wept for Tammuz, that is for the dead Adonis, "whom they will hail on the third day as having come to life again." There the twenty-five men between the porch and the altar worshipped the sun towards the east; and there the reproductive power in nature was adored under the realistic symbol of a stock, or pole, or trunk, which could become a serpent, and from a serpent revert again to the form of a rod. Too much stress cannot be laid on the fact that by a wholly independent growth the same symbolism was employed in the same worship in Egypt as in Hellas or Italy. Everywhere the two emblems, upright and oval, are invariably found together; and both have served as a basis practically of all ornamentation in the architecture of the East and the West. As to the origin and meaning of these emblems, there must be no paltering. The tree and the serpent are confessedly, according to the story, the same thing. The one may become the other; and this tree

and serpent are in the midst of the garden or paradise ; and the paradise is the human body. The story in the book of Genesis is a symbolical narrative, flimsily veiled, of the course of sexual passion. The tree is the phallos, and the phallos is the May-pole which still lingers on some of our village greens. The ship of Athēnē, in the Panathenaic pomp, is the Yoni of the Hindu, and the Yoni is the source of all sensible or physical life. It has the promise and potency of unnumbered generations. It is the Argo which carries all the heroes of the Greek world. Thirty years ago Dr. Donaldson thought it well to throw over these statements the veil of what is commonly spoken of as a learned language. It is too late to adopt such devices now. To pretend ignorance of the meaning of these emblems involves something not far removed from dishonesty and fraud. What we have to note especially is that the upright emblem was invested with an inherent vitality, and put forth leaves, in the Thyrsos of the Dionysian worshippers of Hellas not less than in the budding rod of Aaron. It became the tree of life, the rod of wealth and happiness given by Apollon to Hermes, the mystic spear which Abaris received from the Hyperborean sun-god, and which came daily to Phoebus in his time of banishment laden with all good things. As the palladion, it became a potent guard against evil, and as such, took many forms, as in the lituus of the augur, the crooked staff of the shepherd, and the sceptre of the king. It became also the stauros, or pole, or cross of the Egyptian Osiris, —the guarantee for the maintenance and multiplication of all human and sentient life, the guardian and helper of all who believed in its protecting power. It evoked impressions of devotion scarcely less fervent than those in which catholic hymn-writers have sung the praises of the Arbor Vitæ, the Crux Salutifera of the churches of Christendom.

But the chief development of this theology was connected rather with the oval than with the upright emblem. The former, as we have said, became the Argo and was seen again in the shell of Aphrodite, in the ship of Athēnē, and in the Lotos ; we find it also in the horn of Amaltheia, the nurse of Zeus, who gave to it the power of supplying to its possessor all that he could desire to have. It is the inexhaustible table of the Ethiopians, the wishing-quern of the Norse Frodi, the wonderful well of Apollon Thyrsis in Lykia, the cup of Rhea and Demeter, and the modios of Serapis. That the whole imagery of the story of the Sangreal is directly derived from the language applied to these ancient emblems, any may see who will examine the chapters of the Arthurian romance which deal with it. The myth has here become cleansed and purified. No degradation could well be greater than that of the throngs who hurried to the temples of the Babylonian Mylitta ; but we have seen the myth, starting from its crude and undisguised forms, assume the more harmless shapes of goblets and cups of fertility and plenty, of rings, crosses, and spears, until finally, in the Sangreal legend, the symbols have become a sacred thing which only the pure in heart may see and touch. To Lancelot, who acts the

part of Paris in the Greek tale, it either remains invisible, or is seen only to leave him stretched senseless on the earth. The myth, which degraded the Hierodoultoi of the Corinthian Aphrodite, has taken its fixed shape in the picture of unselfish devotion which sheds its glory on the career of Galahad. The teaching of the Arthurian romance differed, probably, not greatly from that which was furnished to the initiated in the Eleusinian and other mysteries of the Hellenic race.

In these mysteries we have another instrument by means of which the old Greek religion and religious usages have influenced those of the Christian world. Of the Hellenic mysteries our knowledge is unfortunately scanty; but we have no reason for supposing that they were less dramatic in character than those of Egypt or Hindustan. There is no doubt that the acts of the great Eleusinian festival reproduced incidents in the myth of Demeter. There is not the slightest doubt that the processions of Athênê and Dionysos at Athens exhibited precisely the same symbols which marked the worship of the Hindu Vishnu and Sacti, of the Egyptian Isis and the Teutonic Hertha. The substantial identity of rites furnishes a presumption for a substantial identity of doctrines; and these doctrines were concerned not so much with Zeus or Apollon or other deities of the heavens, as with those of the under-world, the gods of the productive and destructive forces of nature and death. As such, in Dr. Hatch's judgment, they were probably "the survival of the oldest religion of the Greek races and of the races which preceded them." The rites of Eleusis were originally open only to Ionians, just as we have seen that limitations were at first placed on the right of taking part in the great Olympian or Delphic festivals. Later on they were thrown open to all Greeks, and even to Romans, and to women as well as to men.

Scanty as our knowledge of the mysteries and their ritual may be, the fact that they have very largely affected the worship and the teaching of the Christian churches can be proved, we may fairly say, to demonstration. If the New Testament gospels can be taken as in any degree trustworthy narratives (and of this I say nothing here), it is a matter of certainty that the great Teacher at His last meal with His disciples bade them simply to remember Him whenever they should eat bread and drink wine, these being symbols or signs of His body and His blood. Whatever the meaning of these terms, it is certain that not one of the gospels shows a trace of any ritual connected with the giving of bread and wine. There is no initiation, nor is there the least secrecy. We are told that He gave thanks on taking the bread and again on taking the wine. But there is absolutely nothing more, and the passage interpolated into the eleventh chapter of St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians agrees altogether with the evangelic narratives. Everything is plain, straightforward, and simple. There are no ceremonies, and no forms of words prescribed as necessary to be used in these commemorations. But when from the gospel stories we turn to the somewhat later history of the Christian Church, we find that a great change has been

at work. Dr. Hatch declares emphatically that "up to a certain time there is no evidence that Christianity had any secrets. It was presented openly to the world. It guarded worship by imposing a moral bar to admission. But its rites were simple, and its teaching was public. After a certain time all is changed : mysteries have arisen in the once open and easily accessible faith, and there are doctrines which must not be declared in the hearing of the uninitiated." The very names by which the ordinances known as sacraments are described have been changed. "So early as the time of Justin Martyr we find a name given to baptism which comes straight from the Greek mysteries, the name enlightenment, *φωτισμός*. It came to be the constant technical term." In the same way the offerings placed upon the table of which the faithful partook came to be called mysteries, the final result being that by the end of the fifth century, "every Christian ordinance is in the pages of the Areopagite Dionysios expressed in terms which are applicable to the mysteries."

But what were the specific changes introduced by the influence of the old Greek religion on the simple commemoration spoken of in the gospel narratives? There are at least some points in the ritual of the mysteries which are known to us, and which are as prominent in modern ritual as they are conspicuously absent from the evangelic records. We know that the ceremonial began with the proclamation that none should enter whose hands were not clean and whose tongue was not prudent. This proclamation, Dr. Hatch remarks, was probably accompanied by some words or sights of terror. We hear that Nero was by these sights or words deterred from presenting himself for initiation ; but nothing can be built on such a tale. The sights or sounds no doubt were there ; but in all likelihood, whatever the sights may have been, the words consisted of denunciations threatening all hypocrites or unworthy communicants with the "divers diseases and sundry kinds of death" denounced also on such persons in the English order for the administration of the Lord's Supper. Whatever may have been the outward changes which it introduced, the influence of the Greek mysteries and the religious societies akin to them was exerted on an enormous scale throughout the eastern part of the empire. It could not be avoided. It could scarcely be resisted, if it were only for this reason, that the majority of them had, in Dr. Hatch's judgment, the same aims as Christianity itself, being in fact "part of a great religious revival which distinguishes the age."

In what has been said of Greek religion, the faith of the Latin tribes has been drawn out in its chief characteristics. In the principles which underlay the original Greek eupatrid, or household religion, the Roman patricians, who regarded themselves as exclusively the *populus, polis*, or state, were heartily and absolutely agreed. They were agreed also in the beliefs which dealt with the action of such beings as the Fata, or Parcae, on the conduct of human life. But of the rich and wild luxuriance of imagination which marked the religious thought of the Greek the Latin showed

scarcely a trace. The great poets of the Augustan age borrowed, at will, from the vast mass of Greek mythical tales, and set before their countrymen a mythology for which the latter never had any genuine liking, and to which they felt no attraction. On the people of the country, far removed from town influences, these foreign narratives seem never to have made any deep or permanent impression, or perhaps any impression at all. The gods of this country population, which had at one time been the only gods worshipped by all the Latin tribes, were practically nothing more than physical processes and powers called by the names which naturally expressed them. The seed-time, the harvest, the cycle of the seasons, the periods and fortunes of human or other life, the garnering and grinding of grain, all these, with other incidents in the history of the revolving year, were marked by a particular name; and this name passed for that of the gods by whom these processes were supposed to be wrought. For the Greeks the glory of human life was intensified in the persons and the work of their deities. For the Latins, their gods, although their name was legion, remained mysterious beings without human form or feeling; and they influenced human affairs without having any sympathy with human hopes, fears, or joys. Neither had they, like the Greek deities, any society among themselves. There was for them no Olympus where they gathered to take counsel with the father of gods and men. They had no parentage, no marriage, no offspring. They thus became a mere crowd of oppressive beings, living beyond the circle of human interests, yet constantly interfering within it; and so between them and their worshippers there was no real and direct connection. In Rome itself, and probably there only, the Greek deities became a fashion, and were honoured with an exotic worship. The true Roman ritual was that which had for its object the worshipping of the household gods; and here they stood, as we have seen, on common ground with the Greek eupatrid. In the literature of Rome the genuine deities of the country are so strangely jumbled up with the importations from the East, that it becomes sometimes difficult to distinguish the one from the other. Still we can see plainly enough that Jupiter was for them, in a greater degree than for the Greeks, the god of the heaven, or sky, the name being common to the Aryan races generally; and that Minerva is a genuine Latin goddess of the dawn, the name being manifestly connected with *promenervare*, used in the Carmen Saliare as equivalent to the kindred verb *monere*, to advise or warn, and again with the Latin *mens*, the Greek *menos*, the Sanskrit *manas*, mind, and the Latin *mane*, morning. To the same source, probably, we must refer the name Moneta applied to Juno as the guardian of the Capitoline saint. We need take only a few more examples, if we would wish to see the staple of the old Latin beliefs. We might suppose that the name of the Latin Hercules merely reproduces that of the Greek Herakles; but the names have probably nothing to do with each other. As a Latin god, Hercules seems to have been connected with boundaries and fences, like the Zeus Herkeios of the Greeks; and the

earliest form of the name was seemingly Hercules or Herclus, as is shown by the popular exclamation Mehercle, and Mehercule. The one story told of him turns on an exploit of a being called Garanus, or Recaranus, and his antagonist answers to the Vedic Vritra, the enemy of Indra. In this story Caius is, what his name implies, a one-eyed monster who steals the cattle, that is, the rain-giving clouds.

In Saturnus, whose name denotes him to be the sower of the seed, we have a deity belonging to a group of gods which represent the processes going on from seed-time to harvest and onward to seed-time again. With him we may take Pilumnus, Picumnus, and Semo Sancus. The first and second of these are said to have been brothers, and were worshipped as rural deities; but their names are mere epithets, Pilumnus being the grinder of corn, and Picumnus the tiller of the earth. The names Semo Sancus are sometimes taken together as if they denoted one deity. They are really two, Sancus being, like the Zeus Pistios, or Horkios of the Greeks, the ratifier of oaths or contracts; while Semo, like Saturnus, is the sower of the seed. After the same fashion, Pomona is a goddess of fruit-trees and their fruits. She is said to have been loved by Silvanus, a deity of the woods; by Picus, who is in fact Picumnus; and by Vertumnus, the god of the changing seasons. In these returning seasons the giver of plenty is known as Anna Perenna, of whom Vergil speaks as a sister of the Carthaginian Dido. The name was naturally referred to the words *annus* and *perennis* by people who had forgotten its meaning; but in Sanskrit we have a deity named Apna Purna, who is bent by the weight of her full breasts and in whom all good is united. A similar idea is expressed in the title Bona Dea, a sister or daughter of Faunus, worshipped by women only.

But as regards the religion of Italy, the Lares are of far more importance than most of the gods who, in later ages, were identified with Greek deities. The Lares were the true guardians of the primitive Latin home, which we have already examined as clearly as the materials at our command enable us. They were, in fact, the spirits of the ancestors who had each in turn represented the first progenitor of the family. They were commonly addressed as Manes, a name denoting goodness or kindness, like that of the Greek Eumenides. It recurs in the name of the Italian goddess, Mana, and in the word *immanis*, cruel. The spectres of the dead were named Larvæ; those of them who were supposed to be capable of injuring the living being called Lemures.

The religious and philosophical thought of the old Greek world has exercised a vast influence, direct and indirect, on the theology of Christendom. The influence of the old Roman religion shows itself not less prominently in the thaumaturgy of the Latin church, and in all the usages connected with it. The latter is perhaps of scarcely less moment than the former. Marvels and prodigies constitute the title deeds of sacerdotalism; and until the belief in them is absolutely extinguished the domination of the priestly order must continue.

THE INFLUENCE OF PAGANISM ON CHRISTIANITY.

By C. F. KEARY.

SOME years ago, eight or ten I daresay, I happened, when passing down Tottenham Court Road, to be the witness of a little ceremony which I daresay a great many of you have seen somewhere or other in London, which is, at any rate, I have no doubt, to be seen every year.

I was passing one of the great furniture shops in that street, when the door opened, and there issued from it, instead of the one or two shoppers whom one might have expected to see, a beadle in all the glory of his official costume, followed by a crowd of boys, some of whom carried white sticks, peeled osier or willow I suppose.

The beadle stopped at a mark on the pavement, and the boys set to work to beat it with their ticks. This was, in fact, what we are all familiar enough with by name, the custom which is called "beating the bounds."

If you have ever seen this performance, you could hardly help being struck, as I was, by its extreme ridiculousness in itself. But if you happened to be at all interested in studying the history of customs and ceremonies, the very ridiculousness of this one would have been rather attractive to you, because you would have said to yourself, "This cannot be the original form of the ceremony I am looking at. There must have been some more reasonable and sensible form, which has got decayed, so to say, to this unmeaning ceremony. What was it?" Now, suppose a man who had given a good deal of time to studying the history of institutions and customs, but who had never before heard of this custom of beating the bounds, to see what I saw in Tottenham Court Road, he would, I think, at once fix upon the most absurd part of the present custom as probably the most ancient (because, you see, it is natural that the oldest part should be the part the meaning of which has been most completely lost sight of), and, of course, this most ridiculous part of the ceremony is the custom of beating the pavement. But he might go on farther, and say to himself, "Beating implies some one to beat; the sticks could not have been meant originally to fall on the back of the flag stones in Tottenham Court Road." And he might make a good guess at the real origin of the custom by saying, "How if, originally, the boys in this ceremony, instead of beating something else, had to be beaten themselves?" That is a guess which he might make merely from his natural acuteness,

and the guess would be the right one. That is the real fact of the case. I don't know that anybody would find it out by merely guess-work in the way I have supposed. But we know well enough, as a fact, that a different and, for the principal actors, a much less agreeable form of beating the bounds is still practised in some countries, and was still practised not more than a hundred years ago in some parts of our own.

I read only the other day in a sort of magazine, published about sixty years ago, a letter from a man who said that he remembered how the beating of the bounds was carried out in Cumberland in his childhood. There the boys or some boys in the village were actually taken to certain boundary marks, and received a good thrashing at each. And in connection with the same ceremony, he mentioned another custom which, as I hope presently to show you, had probably its roots in a very remote past. The same day on which the bounds were marked out, the clergyman of the parish used to go to three or four set trees, which stood at different parts of the parish boundaries, and read a portion of the gospel of the day from each; or sometimes he would preach a short sermon, taking his text from the gospel for the day. These trees, which were of course landmarks in fixing the limits of the various parishes, were called gospel trees or gospel oaks. And you know that there is a station in the north of London which still preserves this name Gospel Oak. I have no doubt that the public house from which the station took its name stood on or near the site of one of these gospel trees.

The older form of the ceremony of beating the bounds was not of course a pleasant practice so far as the boys were concerned; but I daresay you will see the use of it if you consider a moment. Suppose a state of society in which maps and charts do not exist, when title-deeds and the lawyers' offices that contain them are unknown. You will see that in such a state of things there really are no means of preserving the memory of the boundaries of a parish, or, let me rather say, of a village, except the recollection which the inhabitants have of it. Taken for example, that two neighbouring villages have agreed together that such and such a tree, such and such a rock, such a portion of a stream, should mark the boundary between them; suppose that years and years have passed without there being any dispute over the matter, but that at last a dispute arises, what can the villagers have to refer to in such case but that which still has to be called into evidence sometimes, and which still has a place in our law books, what is called the memory of the oldest inhabitant? But the oldest inhabitant at the time the dispute arose was likely enough a very young inhabitant at the time the boundary was fixed. If he had been then a mere boy, he would have had no natural interest in the mere determining of the boundaries itself. How to give him an interest—of a certain sort? That is the question. People foresaw that his memory might be called upon. The way they hit upon was to give him and his comrades a thrashing at the important boundary mark, and to hope that that would impress it upon

their minds. Such is the origin of that unmeaning ceremony which we still keep up as "beating the bounds." I chose this illustration in order to show how some common custom of to-day may, if we are at all given to historical studies, take our thoughts back to a very remote past, a time so remote that there were no written records, and no means of preserving the recollection of such things as boundaries, except the memory of the people themselves. Such a time would take us back in our own history before the conversion of our forefathers to Christianity, before probably our English forefathers ever came into this country. For, as I suppose you know, the English race was originally German; we came into this country as conquerors from Germany, and our remotest history takes us back to a time when our forefathers lived side by side with the ancestors of the Germans of to-day. Having got thus far, I will ask you to lend me your imaginations, while I try and draw to you some picture of the primitive, the very early life of our far-away ancestors, as far back as we have any clear traces of them in the abyss of time. Then towns were not; people were only grouped together in villages. The picture must not stand in England, for, as I have just said, it belongs to a time so remote that it lies before the coming of our forefathers into this country. We should take, for instance, the country which was afterwards called Old Saxony, I mean after our Saxon forefathers had settled in England, which thus became New Saxony. This country of Old Saxony was described years after the remote period of which I am thinking as so thickly wooded that a squirrel might travel for seven leagues without needing to touch the ground. Wild nature was everywhere; the clearings and villages which were the signs of man's habitation, appeared only like islands in the midst of the waste.

In this world of forest or, where not a forest, of heath or moor, each village was, in a certain sense, a tribe—a nation to itself. Of course the people altogether, that is to say, groups of many villages, constituted a larger nation; but there might still remain a good deal of internal strife or half hostility between village and village. And the stronger the village was, the more it made it a point of honour to keep round itself a wide belt of waste country or forest land, which it claimed as, to a certain extent, its own. The real boundary of the village lay outside this claimed territory; but over the greater part of this wild country most of the inhabitants never passed. Their own houses did not stand close together; and you must not think of a modern English village when I use this word. You must think of houses, or rather small, one-roomed wooden huts scattered here and there among the forest trees, very likely only one or two being visible at the same time. But still there were paths, no doubt, from house to house, and there were places, no doubt, where the villagers met from time to time for merry-makings, or to hold a village council, or for some religious ceremony. All round, however, this familiar territory there lay the vast unknown, uncultivated forest or heath. The more warlike part of the villagers, the young men, probably, who thought themselves superior to

agricultural pursuits, spent their time in hunting over this wild country. To a certain extent this forest land was committed to their charge, for the village still claimed it as its own property, and the invasion, without leave, of this country by any stranger would be, as you like to put it, either an act of trespass or a declaration of war. Thus, from the earliest time, we can trace a certain division in the life of our forefathers, that is to say, between the life of the more peaceful villagers and that of the warlike portion of the inhabitants.

It was in the midst of this forest land that our heathen forefathers had their holy places, what served them in the place of temples and the homes of their gods. For our heathen forefathers did not build temples. "The Germans," says the Roman writer who has told us most about our German forefathers, "build no fanes and make no images for worship; but in the midst of their forest recesses they call upon the unseen Presence, which they honour under the names of various gods." And it is a curious thing that when, in later years, these people learnt the notion of a temple or a house for the gods, they gave it a name which literally means "grove," showing that the original dwelling-places of their gods had been in the midst of groves.

The author whom I have just quoted gives us an account of one particular grove which was renowned far and wide among one of the great divisions of the German people, and whither people used to come long distances as on a sort of pilgrimage. Human sacrifices were offered there to the chief god among the ancient Germans. Those who entered the sacred enclosure did so with chains round their necks to show their subjection to the god; if a man fell down while inside the grove, he might not raise himself upright again, but must crawl out on hands and knees. And there are other descriptions of sacred groves, and of the victims (animals of all kinds, not excluding men) being brought to them and hung upon the trees. "Single trees," says a certain author, "are accounted so sacred, that they themselves receive a sacrifice." Can we doubt that two friendly villages, or friendly tribes, worshipping, as they would do, the same gods, would often have a common sacred grove (for that sacred grove of which I spoke just now was common to a whole nation of separate tribes), and that this sacred grove would stand as near as might be midway between the two villages which united in worship there, that is, in the very middle of their boundary forest. In such a grove there would be one tree which was more holy than the others, a single tree like those spoken of in the passage quoted above, "which was counted so sacred, that the victims were hung on it, and sacrifices (for that is what our author intends) offered to it as to a god. When ages passed by, and the boundary waste between village and village was cultivated, these most sacred trees would be left standing, or new trees which grew upon the sites would be held as sacred. And I make bold to guess that just in the same way that beating the bounds takes us back to primeval days almost, or, at any rate, to days of extreme ant

quity, so do those "gospel oaks" on the boundaries of a parish, and the custom of preaching from them, take us back to the days of the sacred groves of our forefathers, and to the time when what became in Christian days the gospel oak was the sacred tree of that heathen grove.

The chief gods worshipped in this wise by our forefathers were those from whom we have inherited the three central days of the week—Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Tuesday is the day of Tew or Tiw; Wednesday, the day of Wodin or Wedan, or Odin, as he was called in the north; Thursday is Thor's day. I cannot say that these days of the week have been so called precisely because they were days left holy to Tew, Wodin, and Thor.¹ But, at any rate, these names of the days of the week preserve the memory of the gods of our forefathers. Friday preserves the memory of a goddess—Freyja is a goddess of Spring and of Love.

Of these gods, the two whose character stands out most vividly before us are Wodin and Thor. Both were gods of the storm. Wodin rode through the air on the swiftest of horses (the wind), Thor drove rumbling over the hills in his chariot (the thunder), and wielded a miraculous hammer (the crusher), which had this faculty, that when hurled from the hand it struck the victim, and then, like a boomerang, returned to the hand which sent it forth. Of Tiw (called in the Scandinavian lands Tyr) we know less. What seems highly probable is that each of these three divinities, the chief made divinities among the ancient Germans, among our ancestors, among the ancestors of Norsemen, Danes, and Swedes alike, were at one time very nearly akin, and each at one time was more than anything a god of the overarching sky. But in obedience to the warlike character of those who worshipped them, these gods became gods rather of the stormy sky than of the clear heaven; they became gods of the storm, of the wind, and of the thunder, and in so doing they became pre-eminently gods of battle. For of course men of all ages have confounded the ideas of storm and of battle, as their language shows well enough. We to-day tell of the storm of battle, and the battle of the elements. And an ancient heathen poem calls the battle

"The storm of spears, the wrath of Wodin."

If, then, we want to gain one picture more characteristic than any other of the religion of our heathen forefathers, we must fancy them waiting in these dark groves until the storm draws nigh, and when they hear the wind howling through the trees, let us fancy them falling upon their faces, not daring to look up until the storm has gone by; for in the unseen being who meets the storm they recognise the unseen presence which, as the Roman author says, they called by the names of various gods. Or let me

¹ The origin of our names for the days of the week is rather this. Our remoter ancestors had a week of nine days. But when they became acquainted with the Roman week of seven days they adopted that. They found the days of the week called after certain Roman divinities. Some of these names they kept; for others they substituted the name of their own god in place of the Roman god—Tiw for Mars, Wodin for Mercury, Thor for Jove.

quote a description from a contemporary writer upon the religion of our heathen forefathers :—

"If in these days," says the author, "we wish to feel the mystic presence of the great god of the Germans, let us do as our worshipping forefathers did, withdraw from the concourse of men, find out some forest solitude, and wait there. Let it be in one of the vast stretches of pine-forest in the north of Germany; perhaps in the very spot where lay that haunted grove which Tacitus describes. There you will feel as you should the strange and awful stillness which from time to time reigns in forests such as these. Presently the quiet is broken, first by a sound like a low sigh which arises, as if from the ground itself, and breathes throughout the wood. Next from the distance another sound is heard, so like the sound of the sea, that you might swear—had you never been in such a place before—that you could hear the waves drawing back over the pebbly beach. As it approaches, the sound grows into a roar. It is the roar of the tempest—the coming of Wodin."

According to the accounts which come to us from the Scandinavian countries, there was one other characteristic of Wodin's ride through the air, which must not be forgotten. There rode with him a certain troop of maidens, a sort of northern Amazon, who were known as the helm-maidens or sheep-maidens of Wodin. These maidens, too, rode on horses or bare-backed steeds, and in one beautiful passage describing these horses of Wodin's helm-maidens, it says :—

"Their horses shook themselves, and from their manes there fell
Dew in the deep dales, and on the high hills hail,"

which shows clearly enough that in the conception of that poet, at any rate, the horses which these Amazons rode were like Wodin's horse—the clouds.

This is enough to give one side (the most important side) of the religion of our heathen forefathers; perhaps I should rather say, enough to suggest this side of their belief; and even so it needs that you should do your utmost to bring your imaginations to bear upon the picture. You have as far as possible, to listen with their ears to the howl of the wind in deep forest recesses, or in desolate tracts around, to listen with their ears to the rumble or the crash of the thunder, distant or near, and try and realize how the storm sounded in the ears of those to whom it gave audible token of the approach of a god. To those who lived most peacefully in the centre of the village, by the clearings and the homesteads, and who did not often venture out into the dimmer groves, these were sounds of almost un-mixed terror. But the more warlike portion of the villagers, those who spent half their days in hunting through these same wild tracts of country, or whose duty it was to station themselves in the forest region to guard against the danger of invasion, these would deem themselves the very companions of the war-god, his chosen champions and children.

These were the majority, or, at any rate, the ruling spirits, and it was through them that the ancient heathenism took its fierce and warlike character. Still, there was a more peaceful side. There were some gods—and still more goddesses—who belonged to this side of their belief—goddesses of the hearth and of simple domestic duties. Some of the names of these are still preserved in German popular sayings and German popular superstitions. And it is natural, when we come to think of it, that these peaceful divinities should be better remembered in Germany than elsewhere; for the more warlike of the heathen Germans of old time (like our own ancestors) migrated *out of* Germany, and so the more peaceful must have been left behind.

One name of an ancient goddess which is much used to-day is Bertha, originally Perchsa, the "Bright one," who exists in popular superstition, as Frau Bertha, Mrs. Bertha. Another is Frau Holda. If women spinning flax leave some upon the distaves at night, Frau Holda is supposed to come and tangle it all before the next morning, as a punishment for their idleness. This is especially likely to happen at the time of year which has only lately passed, what are called the Twelve Days, from Christmas to the sixth of January, the Epiphany. Those twelve days are, it is certain, connected quite as much with the ancient German religion as with the Christian, Yule-tide, or New Year's Day, which falls in the very centre of these twelve days, was the greatest feast among our heathen ancestors. When the snow falls, the Germans say to-day that Frau Bertha is making her bed, and it is the feathers from the bed which are falling to the ground.

A goddess formerly known in this country was Ostara, or Eástre, whose festival, celebrated in the spring, came to be confounded with the Church festival of the resurrection, to which it has given (strangely enough) its name, the name of the goddess of our heathen ancestors.

But the worship of the goddesses who were, for the most part, divinities of the spring, or of the harvest, or of the hearth and home, formed a small part of the creed of our ancestors, beside the worship of the war-gods; and it is on this side of their creed that we must chiefly fix our attention.

For now let the centuries pass on. The German races grow more and more into nations, and become the great conquering people of the world. Some invade Italy, some Spain and Africa, some France; our own ancestors, as you know, take possession of this country. The nations or tribes who perform these several feats bear different names, but they all belong to the same stock; they all originally came out of Germany, and we know that the religion of all was the same. So far as their religion goes, the German races in these different lands all underwent the same fate, each was sooner or later converted to Christianity. The missionary comes among them—we have accounts of these conversions—and preaches to the people. If he is a very bold man, he sets to work to cut down the sacred trees of the villagers, or their most sacred grove. Sometimes he pays the penalty for his rashness, sometimes, according to the accounts, his preaching is

vindicated by a miracle. Anyway he at last succeeds ; and on the very place where stood the grove sacred to Wodin there stands now a church dedicated to the new faith. This plan of building the church upon the very spot which was sacred to the old religion we know to have been generally adopted ; and it was typical of the whole procedure of Christianity when she set to work to convert our heathen forefathers. As far as possible places which were sacred before were permitted to remain still sacred, only they somewhat changed their character.

Think of how many places there are, both in this country and in Germany, or, again, in the Scandinavian countries, which still bear the name of the heathen gods. Such a place as Wednesfield is really Wodinsfield, Wednesbury is Wodensbuy, or bury. We have Thurfield or Thorsfield ; Thorsdyke, Thursford, Thurso, are a few of the English names which commemorate the great gods of heathendom. Baldersly is another, preserving the name of the northern god Balder, a god of peace and of spring-time. I could mention fifty names of the same sort if I were to go to France and Germany.

Still more striking is the way in which the sacred seasons of heathendom have been preserved in Christianity. The most important festival of our heathen forefathers fell about the time in which we now celebrate the greatest Christian festival, the birth of Christ. We cannot, however, say that in this case the accommodation of one festival to the other has been mainly other than accidental. What is the proper season for celebrating Christmas we cannot tell. The tradition which placed the birth of Christ at the particular season of the year at which we celebrate it, is only a tradition. No information upon the subject is to be extracted from the gospels. But it suited very well with the creed of our heathen forefathers that this tradition should be observed. For their most sacred and most festive season was just that of the new year ; and as it is (as I have already pointed out) their greatest festival Yule—New Year's day—falls precisely in the middle of the twelve days between Christmas and Epiphany.

So it was, as we have just shown, with Easter.

The method, moreover, of celebrating this festive season unquestionably dates rather from heathen than from Christian times ; for we have records sufficient of the way Yule was kept in Scandinavian countries in days when the inhabitants were still Odin-worshippers to show that the festival was as like as might be to our Christmas. Even in our day popular superstitions, stories of magic, especially of what we may call natural magic, cluster round Yuletide as they do round other seasons of the year. During the mysterious "Twelve days" the beasts in the stall are supposed to acquire the gift of human speech. They prophecy the events of the coming year, if any man is fortunate enough to hear them. Each day of these twelve days is a prophecy of the corresponding month of the twelve. If it is fine that day the corresponding month will be fine ; if the day is rainy or stormy,

so will the corresponding month be. Of course all these magic properties of the twelve days culminate during the central night, New Year's eve, which is in popular superstition in Germany to-day a much more important night than Christmas eve. On New Year's eve people make visits at midnight to their fruit-trees, and sing a rhyme round them—the relic of some heathen incantation, or they dress them with ribbons, a relic of the victims offered to trees in the old days, or sprinkle them with water, a mixture between a Christian and a heathen rite. These rites are supposed to make the trees fruitful during the coming year. People do these things, I say, still in Germany; but it is only quite of late that these customs have decayed in England. If you read Hone's "Year Book" or "Day Book," or Brand's "Popular Superstitions," or Strutt's "Sports and Pastimes," you will find records sufficient of the same beliefs.

I have already referred to the fact that the great Christian festival has taken its name (in our country) from a goddess of our forefathers. And I do not think that it would be possible to produce any stronger proof that the passage from the older creed to the new was not a violent transition, and that there was plenty of room, therefore, for the beliefs and customs which belonged to the former creed to find a place in the latter.

Though the Christians (in England) adopted the name of the festival of Ostara or Eástre, for their own festival, I imagine that the worship of the spring goddess is best represented by the May-day celebrations which, in our country, were always the next most important after the celebrations of Yuletide, which have, of course, very nearly disappeared from among us now. I need not remind you of what these May-day celebrations were like, of how the boys and girls from the villages used to go out into the neighbouring wood to cut the May-pole, which was carried home on a wagon drawn by as many as twenty or forty yoke of oxen, "and every oxen hath a nosegay of sweete flowers tied to the top of his hornes," as a disapproving writer of the sixteenth century describes it. Of course the vigour with which these ancient customs were preserved died down very much with us after the reign of the Puritans.

But this direct borrowing by Christian from heathen days, in order to fill up what I may call the interstices of life; this continuation of harmless or comparatively harmless festivals, customs, and superstitions, from the old days to the new, forms only a very small part of the survival of heathendom in mediæval Christianity. It would be the more peaceful side of the heathen creed which was adopted in this quiet way by Christendom. We have seen that it is the peaceful divinities Frau Holda or Frau Bertha, or our Eástre, whose names were kept most alive in the mouths of the people. Up to the time of the conversion of our forefathers, the warrior class had come more and more to the front; for the era which preceded the conversion of these different German races, the English in England, the Franks in France, the Goths in Spain and Italy, had been an era of conquest. Now would come the turn for the quieter members of the community to

come to the front. They would be the ones to go over most easily to Christianity, and it would be out of their ranks that the Christian priesthood would be most often drawn. In theory, at any rate, the Christian priest forswore the use of arms, wherefore, upon the whole, the influence of the priestly order would be cast upon the peaceful side of life. The young priest would carry with him into the new faith rather the ideas of the simple householder of the village than of the warrior class. By him, therefore, the wind-god of the forest would be looked upon with more and more of terror; and he would throw off the old creed with a sense of relief at, so to say, freeing himself from the jurisdiction of Wodin, and placing himself under the protection of the God of the Christians. But he could never feel that he had entirely withdrawn himself from the dominion of the ancient god of storm. For ancient fears are not easily shaken off. In the dark and silent forest ways there still reigned for the Christian priest or for the peasant a haunting presence, but it was no longer the presence of a protecting divinity, it was that of a god whose worship had been abandoned, who was at war with his god, who had become an anti-god or a devil. Thus arose that idea which is the prevailing idea of the Middle Ages, the omnipresence and immense power of diabolical agencies, all that enormous body of belief with regard to possession by the evil one which created a supposed witch in every village, and led, as I daresay you know, to such terrible cruelties being practised against these imagined servants of Satan.

I wish it were possible for me to convey to you in words the constant sense of diabolical presence which afflicted men's minds in the Middle Ages. The very air seemed haunted, and, as it were, beaten by dark and infernal wings. But perhaps I can—with not very much time still left us—best convey to your minds some notion of the creed of the Middle Ages by asking you to look in imagination at the one great relic which that belief has left, and which is accessible to all—I mean the mediæval cathedral. We have in London our specimen of such a cathedral in Westminster Abbey, one of the most beautiful examples possible, built just about six hundred years ago, when men were imbued with the spirit of the time which it is so difficult for us to realize. Remember, as I have said, that the cathedral architecture of those days is the greatest relic which the Middle Ages have left us, that in which the whole spirit of many centuries—ten silent centuries, as Carlyle calls them—seems to find a voice. The mediæval cathedral represents, if you have the key to read its meaning, the world as it appeared to the men of that time, the world material in a certain sense, and the world spiritual.

Therefore look now at this cathedral. The origin of the mediæval cathedral, as a mere house of worship is, I know, Christian. So far as regards the *idea* simply of a house in which to worship God, that idea traces its descent from the Jewish synagogue to the Christian church. But we have next to see in what form that idea of the house of worship clothed

itself after some centuries, of contact with the heathenism of Northern Europe. Observe the forest-like darkness and height of the building, the roof scarcely visible, the building so shaped and so arranged with its countless pillars that you never seem to see the whole of it; and I protest if you were put down in one of these cathedrals for the first time you would have no idea of its extent. Worship in such a place must be as near a counterpart as worship in *any building* could be, so far as the impression on the senses goes, to the worship in the sacred groves of our heathen forefathers.

So far, then, the mediæval cathedral seems to symbolize that very thing of which we are speaking to-day, the survival of heathen belief in mediæval Christianity. But it does not do this only. Look a little nearer. In the centre of this gloomy forest of pillars stands a lighted altar. I might devote the whole of a lecture merely to showing how much the imagination of men in the middle ages dwelt upon the ideas of light and of candles as symbols of the light of religion; so that when anybody who had recovered from sickness, or been saved from danger, made a dedication to a saint, it was ten to one that the dedication took the form of candles to be lighted on the altar of that saint. These candles, then, are as necessary a part of the symbolism of the cathedral as its vastness, its stupendous height, its gloom and mystery. Above the altar where these lights are always burning, the peaceful faces of saints and angels look down upon the worshipper.

But pass away from this lighted altar and the sacred presence which is believed always to abide there, or go outside of the cathedral altogether, and look at its architecture from without. Here we have no more angels' faces, but in every corner and under every arch you will detect some symbol of the powers of darkness—dragons or devil's heads—or if there are representations of human faces, they are contorted, as if in torment. Do not imagine that these architectural figures (in architecture they are commonly called gargoils) are placed where they are merely by chance. No, they symbolize the lost condition of all men outside the church, cut off from the light of faith which burns on the altar inside.

I need not say how central this belief is in the whole religion of the Middle Ages. "No salvation outside the Church" was, and still is, the watchword of the Catholic Church.

If I have carried you with me at all in what I have been trying to put into words—and we are dealing with thoughts and feelings very difficult to express in words—you will perhaps understand what I meant when I said just now that the mediæval cathedral symbolized both the material and spiritual world of men in those days. For side by side with the spiritual notion, "no salvation outside the Church," went that material notion which gave over all the wild uncultured parts of the material world to the diabolical presences which had once been the ruling spirits in the world of our heathen forefathers.

In these various ways, very difficult to define in exact words, directly

and indirectly, both by attraction and by repulsion, the belief of our heathen forefathers lived on in the belief of the mediæval Christianity.

Remember that this is the most vital way in which one creed can survive in another. Dogmas and formulas matter little if the same sort of images, the same sort of ideas of the supernatural powers, continue to hold captive the popular imagination. You know how the Scotch ballad-monger said, "I care not who makes a nation's laws if I may make their ballads." And just in the relation in which ballads stand to formulated laws the appeals to popular imagination made by such things as the vast and gloomy mediæval cathedral, its echoing chants, the wind-like voice of the organ, or again, all the fragments of popular superstition concerning the power of Satan, the assertions of those who swore that they had heard him hunting out there on the moor, in the forest, with the troops of the damned—just in this relation stand such beliefs as these to the former decrees of councils, or to the established articles of the Christian creed.

Beside the general sense of diabolical presence which pervades all the literature of the Middle Ages there are certain definite myths, certain stories touching the doings of Satan which stand out pre-eminent over the rest. Almost all these stories have survived to our day, and if they are not precisely believed in they excite a certain feeling of superstitious awe.

One of these is the story of the Wild Huntsman. We know him best as Herne the Hunter. Among other places he is supposed to haunt Windsor Forest, as any reader of Harrison Ainsworth's novel with that name will remember. I believe, however, that the old oak called Herne's oak no longer stands. He is a fiend huntsman, with two horns sticking out from his head like Satan, only in the case of Herne they are stag's horns. The story told of him in the Middle Ages was that he had been a wicked noble who cared for nothing but hunting, and hunted even on the Sunday, not only profaning the day himself, but compelling the peasantry on his estate to aid him by beating up the game. So one day there joined him two horsemen, one on a white steed and one on a black, and the latter breathed fire from its nostrils. The horseman on the white steed, who was Herne's good angel, tried to dissuade him from going to the hunt, but he would not listen, and went off with the bad angel on the black horse, saying that he wished he could go on hunting till Doomsday. And that he is now condemned to do. As the storm goes by the peasant of Germany deems that he hears this wild hunt careering through the air, that he distinguishes the shouting of men and barking of dogs, sometimes even it happens (so superstitious belief asserts) that a rain of blood falls from the clouds to the earth. In many parts of England and of France this wild hunt is known as Arthur's Chase. In Germany the huntsman goes by the name of Hackelberg.

By whatever name it may be called it is not difficult to recognise in the wild hunt a slightly transformed picture of the old supreme god of the heathens riding through the air as Wodin rides. In place of the battle in

which Wodin indulges we have a hunt, an idea more familiar to the average peasant. This is almost the sole difference between the myth of Hackelberg, or Herne the Hunter, and the myth of Wodin.

Another still more striking example of a mediæval belief stolen from the bygone religion of our ancestors, and transformed in the stealing, is the great myth, as we may call it, of the Middle Ages, the Witches' Sabbath. This myth undoubtedly grew in precision and in detail as the Middle Ages advanced, but we can trace the germ of it very early. It is this germ which is taken from the myth of Wodin. The Witches' Sabbath told how on a certain day of the year Satan was wont to meet the witches of all the world at a certain place. Usually some well-known mountain was chosen for the scene of this Witches' Sabbath, and in Germany the place most recognised in tradition was the highest mountain of the Harz range in Saxony, the Brocken or Blocksberg. But as a matter of fact there are many mountains in Germany with this same name Blocksberg, and almost all seem to have been connected with the rites of the Witches' Sabbath. It would be impossible to enumerate all the mountains in Europe upon which the same rites were said to have been enacted. Heckla, in Iceland, is one; there were many in Norway and Sweden, others in France, Spain, Italy, the Carpathians, etc. The central figure of the myth is only Wodin, transformed into the Prince of Darkness, and the witches are only the helm-maidens or shield-maidens of Wodin, who have undergone a like transformation.

Observe that these two which I have related are connected with the two great festive seasons of heathen days, namely with Yule and with the May celebrations. Of the subject of the first myth, the Wild Huntsman, it was told that he and his following hunted throughout the year through the sky, except only during the twelve days, and then he hunted on earth. And the Witches' Sabbath, it was said to be held during the eight days following the first of May. Satan, we may suppose, was, during the rest of the year, banished to the molten pit, and allowed to return to earth again during the early days of May.

But what is this belief, put into different words, other than the belief that the *ancient gods* had been banished from earth by the new creed; but during two short seasons—seasons of the old heathen festivals, they were allowed to return to the earth once more.

* * * * *

One word more, in order if possible to clench in your memory the gist of what I have been trying to put before you. All this, all the foregoing lecture, I may say, is in a manner epitomized in one word—*Heathen*. I did not like, at the beginning, to trouble you with verbal distinctions, or I should have explained that the title of this lecture (though the most convenient to express in a popular form its subject) does not express it quite correctly according to the niceties of language. I would rather have used mediæval catholicism in place of Christianity, and heathenism in place of Paganism. For Paganism, which is a word of Latin origin, is naturally

associated in our minds with the religion of what are called the classical peoples—the Greeks and Romans—and heathenism, which is a word of English origin, is appropriate to designate the creed of our own forefathers. And that very word symbolizes the past life of our ancestors, and the wild nature, in the midst of which they imagined their gods to dwell. The heathen is the dweller in the “heath,” the wild uncultivated country far from human habitations. Therefore, in later days, when men had got to dwell more together, and the land was more cultivated, the heathen man was a sort of outlaw, a wild man of the woods, and the gods he persisted in worshipping were thought of by Christian folk no longer as gods, but as terrible fiends, as the Wild Huntsman careering through the forest, or as Satan holding his court on a lonely mountain top.

Wherefore I think you will see what I mean by saying that that one word “heathen,” if we realize its full meaning, contains in itself almost all that I have been trying to say in this lecture, and quite alone affords the sort of glance which we have been trying to take into the remote past, into the dark and backward abysses of Time.

SLAVONIC RELIGION.

BY W. R. MORFILL.

THE subject which I propose to consider in the present lecture is the remains of the ancient beliefs, or superstitions if you will, on which were built up the doctrines of Christianity, when disseminated throughout Slavonic countries in the ninth century. I hope we shall find something to interest us, both in what the old chroniclers tell us of the paganism of their own and preceding times, and also in the many strange customs which have survived among the Slavonic peoples; for it may be boldly said that among no other races of the world have we such a rich fund of folk-song and folk-tale.

Slavonic mythology has been treated of by many Slavonic writers. Schwenk and other Germans have also written upon it, and it has even been discussed by some English authors. The works of the late Mr. Ralston on Russian Folk-tales and Russian Folk-songs may be read with advantage. They abound with allusions to the obscure mythology of the Slavonic peoples. A very interesting little book, also, is that published last year by Mr. Wratislaw, entitled "Sixty Slavonic Folk-tales," in which those curious about the matter may find the origin of many of the tales familiar to them from their infancy. Perhaps, however, before entering upon the question of the religious beliefs of the early Slavs, it might be as well to put before you a few facts about the Slavonic people, and, it must be confessed, that upon these points there exists a great deal of ignorance.

The Slavs inhabit the eastern part of Europe, and have been divided into two great families—a division based upon certain peculiarities in their languages. The south-eastern branch contains the Russians, Bulgarians, and Serbs, to whom may be added the Slovenes in Steiermark, and other southern provinces of Austria. The western Slavs include the Bohemians, or Cheks, who, since the earlier part of the sixteenth century, have belonged to Austria—not by conquest, let us remember, but by a voluntary union—the Poles, whose country, at one time the greatest power of eastern Europe, is divided between Austria, Russia, and Prussia, and the numerically small people of the Lusatians or Sorbs, who are to be found partly in Saxony, living in the country districts round Bautzen, and partly in Prussia, near Cottbus. We may thus gain some idea of the geographical extent of the Slavonic peoples, who probably number something like a hundred millions. In a previous lecture here, I gave it as my opinion that panslavism, as it is called, that bugbear of our western states-

men, was an impossibility on account of the diversity of the creeds of the members of the great Slavonic family. It seems to me that this has always been an impediment to their union. To say nothing of the religious hostility between the Pole and Russian, a phase of the animosity existing between them for centuries, we have people like the Croats and Serbs, who speak the same language, and are in reality identical, yet separated by religious differences. The Croat is a strict Catholic; the Serb belongs to the Greek church.

The Slavonic tribes, being of Indo-European origin, have of course much in common with their European congeners in their ancient religious beliefs. It is only by a careful induction from the various ideas that have been shared in by all members of the human race—including even savages—that we can get anything like a genuine study of primitive beliefs. We shall then find all over the world more or less the same folk-lore, as has been admirably shown in Dr. Tylor's work, "*Primitive Culture*," which may be said to have laid the real foundations of this interesting study.

Who, then, were the gods of the old heathen Slavs?

The chief was Perun, the god of thunder and fire. Fire, we are told, was constantly kept burning among the ancient Russians as a symbol of the sun, which was never quenched. In the same way we find the Parsees worshipping fire at the present day. Hartknoch, who lived at the end of the seventeenth century, says that Perkunas, who is identical with Perun, was the most celebrated deity among the old Prussians. Now the question will naturally arise among you, Who were these old Prussians? They were a people closely connected in race and language with the Slavs, but who have completely disappeared, only leaving their name to the country called Prussia, which is now settled mainly by Germans, whose blood has been mixed a great deal with that of these early inhabitants. Just in the same way a pure Anglo-Saxon will style himself a Briton, and so he is in a way, *i.e.* he lives in the country called Britain; but if we wish to find a pure-blooded Briton, we must of course go to Wales and the Welsh.

According to Hartknoch, Perkunas, or Perun, had a fiery red face, and was represented as surrounded by flames at Kiev, the great seat of his worship. He was exhibited with a stone in his hand, made to represent a thunderbolt. Besides the Russians, he was worshipped by the Bohemians, Poles, and Bulgarians. So great was his *cultus* among the Slavs, that foreigners, owing to their little acquaintance with them or ignorance of their language, rushed to the conclusion that he was their only god. Thus Procopius, the Greek historian, writing in the sixth century, A.D., says, "The Slavs know only one god, the fabricator of lightning, whom they look upon as the ruler of all." He was represented with three heads.

The Aryans of India and the Teutonic tribes continued to worship him as a subordinate member of the family of the gods, but the Letto-Slavs raised him to the dignity of a supreme ruler of all other deities. Woods and trees were dedicated to him. Lithuania abounded in sacred groves and trees, and the grand masters of the Teutonic knights, always at war with them, had many of them as ruthlessly cut down as Agricola did those of the Britons in the Isle of Anglesey. From these sacred groves, as we all know, arose the conception of the Gothic cathedral with its "dim religious light," and, as Emerson beautifully says,—

"From out of Thought's interior sphere,
These wonders rose to upper air,
And nature gladly gave them place,
Adopted them into her race,
And granted them an equal date
With Andes and with Ararat."

Perkunas, or Perkuns, frequently appears in the Lithuanian songs published by Schleicher. According to one of these songs Perkunas cleft the moon—which, we must remember, is masculine among the Slavs—for his infidelity to the sun, which is feminine. He had deserted her and fallen into love with Jutzenka, or the morning-star. Hence the diminished appearances of the moon. Sarnicki, the old Polish chronicler, tells us that whoever neglected to keep the fire in honour of the god perpetually burning, paid the penalty with his life.

In the treaties concluded in the tenth century between the Russians and the Byzantine Greeks, the Russians, according to Nestor, swear by Perun and Veles, the god of flocks. Although the idol of Perun was destroyed by Vladimir, the prince of Kiev, when Russia received Christianity, now more than nine hundred years ago, yet the god was transmuted into the saint Ilya (Elijah). He has become the saint of thunder, and his chariot is said to roll through the sky by a confusion with Elijah's chariot of fire, and the attributes of the two have somehow or other got mixed up with the story of Ilya Muromets, or Ilya of Murom, the giant, who is the hero of many a Russian lay, and is still talked of by the peasantry.

Another Slavonic deity was Radgost or Radegost, who was especially worshipped among the Obotrites, an ancient Slavonic people, who occupied the territory corresponding to the modern Mecklenburg. For perhaps it is not generally known that a large part of northern Germany was originally occupied by Slavonic peoples, who have left their names still marked upon the country; such, for example, as Leipsic, Rostock, Potsdam, Berlin, Anhalt-Zerbst and hundreds of others. The old German chroniclers such as Helmold, Thietmar, and Adam of Bremen tell us about Radegost, who was represented as a warrior. Horses were consecrated to him. Several places in Bohemia bear a name resembling his, and were perhaps called after him.

There was a god of cattle, Volos or Voles, previously alluded to in con

nection with the treaties; the Russians have turned the worship of this deity into that of St. Blasius. Traces are to be found of the *cultus* of the Sun under the name of Dazhbog; lit., the god who gives. There was a god of the winds named Stribog, who is mentioned in the old prose-poem, "Slovo o polku Igorevê" (the story of the expedition of Igor). There was also Lada said to have been a kind of Slavonic Venus, whose name is occasionally met with in the refrains of songs.

Among Slavonic religious ceremonies was the *trizna*, or feast in honour of the dead. This we find mentioned in the earliest times. Thus, if we take the chronicle of Nestor, we see Olga holding a great *trizna*, or funeral festival, in honour of her husband, Igor, who has been slain by the Dreolians, at the town of Iskorosten. These ceremonies are identical with those practised even at the present time by the Irish, and called wakes. Collins, an Englishman, who was physician to the Tsar Alexis, father of Peter the Great, towards the close of the seventeenth century, tells us of the ceremonies common in his time, when the women weeping would call upon the dead saying such things as, Why didst thou die? Was I not a good wife to thee? Didst thou not have good children? etc., etc.

It used to be the custom in Russia—and probably it has not died out in remote places—to put food upon the graves. At certain seasons of the year the tombs are regularly visited by the relatives of the deceased, and I myself have witnessed some most pathetic scenes of this nature in Russia and heard the unrestrained lamentations of the survivors. Beside the *trizna*, or funeral feast, there was also the festival Sobolka, held in honour of the sun. This festival is called in Russian *Kupalo*: it is celebrated on the 24th of June, the day of St. John the Baptist, who is called Ivan Kupalo from *Kupati*, to bathe, and is said to have been so named because pourings of water were necessary to the ceremony. For it was the quaint belief of the early Slavs—and this curious piece of folk-lore is even yet current in Russia—that the sun and moon wash themselves under the earth in the coldest possible water, so that when they appear their light may be pure and brilliant. At this period the sun was worshipped under the name of Svantovit, the holy leader or conqueror. This has been metamorphosed into Saint Vit, in German Weit, and is the same name as St. Vitus.

If any of you have been to Prague you may, perhaps, have observed that the Cathedral is dedicated to St. Vitus, (Saint Vit). Now St. Vitus was a Sicilian saint, and we are told by some scholars that when Christianity was introduced, the name of St. Vitus was used for this building, because it most resembled that of Svantovit, the god to whom the temple which originally stood there was dedicated. Some, however, have looked upon this explanation as far fetched. Be it as it may, we have certainly found the Slavonic god Veles turned into Vlasii or St. Blaise and the cases are quite analagous. Hanusch, who has written an elaborate work on Slavonic mythology, considers that the nervous affection

The Aryans of India and the Teutonic tribes continued to worship him as a subordinate member of the family of the gods, but the Letto-Slavs raised him to the dignity of a supreme ruler of all other deities. Woods and trees were dedicated to him. Lithuania abounded in sacred groves and trees, and the grand masters of the Teutonic knights, always at war with them, had many of them as ruthlessly cut down as Agricola did those of the Britons in the Isle of Anglesey. From these sacred groves, as we all know, arose the conception of the Gothic cathedral with its "dim religious light," and, as Emerson beautifully says,—

"From out of Thought's interior sphere,
These wonders rose to upper air,
And nature gladly gave them place,
Adopted them into her race,
And granted them an equal date
With Andes and with Ararat."

Perkunas, or Perkuns, frequently appears in the Lithuanian songs published by Schleicher. According to one of these songs Perkunas cleft the moon—which, we must remember, is masculine among the Slavs—for his infidelity to the sun, which is feminine. He had deserted her and fallen into love with Jutzenka, or the morning-star. Hence the diminished appearances of the moon. Sarnicki, the old Polish chronicler, tells us that whoever neglected to keep the fire in honour of the god perpetually burning, paid the penalty with his life.

In the treaties concluded in the tenth century between the Russians and the Byzantine Greeks, the Russians, according to Nestor, swear by Perun and Veles, the god of flocks. Although the idol of Perun was destroyed by Vladimir, the prince of Kiev, when Russia received Christianity, now more than nine hundred years ago, yet the god was transmuted into the saint Ilya (Elijah). He has become the saint of thunder, and his chariot is said to roll through the sky by a confusion with Elijah's chariot of fire, and the attributes of the two have somehow or other got mixed up with the story of Ilya Muromets, or Ilya of Murom, the giant, who is the hero of many a Russian lay, and is still talked of by the peasantry.

Another Slavonic deity was Radgost or Radegost, who was especially worshipped among the Obotrites, an ancient Slavonic people, who occupied the territory corresponding to the modern Mecklenburg. For perhaps it is not generally known that a large part of northern Germany was originally occupied by Slavonic peoples, who have left their names still marked upon the country; such, for example, as Leipsic, Rostock, Potsdam, Berlin, Anhalt-Zerbst and hundreds of others. The old German chroniclers such as Helmold, Thietmar, and Adam of Bremen tell us about Radegost, who was represented as a warrior. Horses were consecrated to him. Several places in Bohemia bear a name resembling his, and were perhaps called after him.

There was a god of cattle, Volos or Voles, previously alluded to in con

nection with the treaties; the Russians have turned the worship of this deity into that of St. Blasius. Traces are to be found of the *cultus* of the Sun under the name of Dazhbog; lit., the god who gives. There was a god of the winds named Stribog, who is mentioned in the old prose-poem, "Slovo o polku Igorevê" (the story of the expedition of Igor). There was also Lada said to have been a kind of Slavonic Venus, whose name is occasionally met with in the refrains of songs.

Among Slavonic religious ceremonies was the *trizna*, or feast in honour of the dead. This we find mentioned in the earliest times. Thus, if we take the chronicle of Nestor, we see Olga holding a great *trizna*, or funeral festival, in honour of her husband, Igor, who has been slain by the Dreolians, at the town of Iskorosten. These ceremonies are identical with those practised even at the present time by the Irish, and called wakes. Collins, an Englishman, who was physician to the Tsar Alexis, father of Peter the Great, towards the close of the seventeenth century, tells us of the ceremonies common in his time, when the women weeping, would call upon the dead saying such things as, Why didst thou die? Was I not a good wife to thee? Didst thou not have good children? etc., etc.

It used to be the custom in Russia—and probably it has not died out in remote places—to put food upon the graves. At certain seasons of the year the tombs are regularly visited by the relatives of the deceased, and I myself have witnessed some most pathetic scenes of this nature in Russia and heard the unrestrained lamentations of the survivors. Beside the *trizna*, or funeral feast, there was also the festival Sobolka, held in honour of the sun. This festival is called in Russian *Kupalo*: it is celebrated on the 24th of June, the day of St. John the Baptist, who is called Ivan Kupalo from *Kupat*, to bathe, and is said to have been so named because pourings of water were necessary to the ceremony. For it was the quaint belief of the early Slavs—and this curious piece of folk-lore is even yet current in Russia—that the sun and moon wash themselves under the earth in the coldest possible water, so that when they appear their light may be pure and brilliant. At this period the sun was worshipped under the name of Svantovit, the holy leader or conqueror. This has been metamorphosed into Saint Vit, in German Weit, and is the same name as St. Vitus.

If any of you have been to Prague you may, perhaps, have observed that the Cathedral is dedicated to St. Vitus, (Saint Vit). Now St. Vitus was a Sicilian saint, and we are told by some scholars that when Christianity was introduced, the name of St. Vitus was used for this building, because it most resembled that of Svantovit, the god to whom the temple which originally stood there was dedicated. Some, however, have looked upon this explanation as far fetched. Be it as it may, we have certainly found the Slavonic god Veles turned into Vlasii or St. Blaise and the cases are quite analagous. Hanusch, who has written an elaborate work on Slavonic mythology, considers that the nervous affection

called St. Vitus' dance took its name from the wild dances which were indulged in during the celebration of the Sobolka. He also sees a trace of the old pagan worship of the sun in the epithet, constantly applied in the old Russian ballads (*bilini*) to Prince Vladimir, *Krasnoe solnishko*, bright sun.

According to the account of Svantovit, given by Saxo Grammaticus, the old Danish historian, his temple was more handsome than was generally the case with the Slavonic deities. It was built of wood and had two courts, an outer and an inner. The roof of the outer was painted red. The god Svantovit, according to the accounts which have come down to us, was a mere monstrosity, with four heads and four necks; in his right hand he held a horn, which was once a year filled with mead by the attendant priest. Sword and bridle were at his side. This great idol was set up at Arema in the island of Rügen. The island itself has now become completely Germanized and no vestiges of its original Slavonic inhabitants are left, but Slavonic was spoken there as late as the fifteenth century. The maintenance of the cult of such a deity was necessarily expensive. The inhabitants paid a tax in support of it, and a third of all booty gained in war was offered. Rich people also brought gifts. Svantovit claimed the service of three hundred horsemen. They fought in his honour, and the spoils they gained were used to decorate the temple. There was also a sacred horse on which Svantovit was believed to ride, although he was invisible. It was pure white, and might only be fed or ridden by the priest, nor dare any one pull a hair from his mane or tail. The records of many countries point to the mysterious appearance of heroes on white horses, who aid the cause of their votaries. We all remember the story told by Livy of the battle of Lake Regillus, at which the twin deities Castor and Pollux appeared, a story which has been made doubly familiar by the spirited lines in Macaulay's "Lays of Ancient Rome."

"The mist of eve was rising,
The sun was hastening down,
When he was aware of a princely pair
Fast pricking towards the town.
So like they were, men never
Saw twins so like before;
Red with gore their armour was,
Their steeds were red with gore.

* * *

And all the people trembled
And pale grew every cheek;
And Sergius the high pontiff
Alone found voice to speak:
The gods who live for ever
Have fought for Rome to-day!
These be the great twin brethren
To whom the Dorians pray."

In the same way Bernal Diaz, the old Spanish chronicler, when writing of the deeds of Cortez, declares that in one of the engagements with the

Indians, St. Jago or James, the patron saint of Spain appeared on a grey horse to animate the Spaniards.

The sacred horse of Svantovit was also consulted as an oracle, when war was about to be declared. Three rows of spears were laid in front of the temple ; special prayers were made to the god, and then the priest led forth the horse. His feet were anxiously watched ; if, when he stepped over the spears, he lifted his right hoof first, the omen was favourable and the proposed expedition might be undertaken. But if he raised the left foot first or both feet moved together, it was a sign that it ought to be abandoned. The classical student will be reminded of the way in which the ancient Romans watched the feeding of sacred chickens as an omen of an engagement about to be undertaken.

But the great ceremony in connection with Svantovit was after the harvest had been got in. The inhabitants assembled from all parts of Rügen, and celebrated a feast. Oxen were offered to the god : the priest, who had unshorn hair, entered the inner enclosure of the temple and swept it ; but during the work he was obliged to hold his breath for fear of defiling the building. If he wished to breathe, he occasionally rushed into the air. He next took the cup from the hand of Svantovit and brought it forth to the crowd outside. From the quantity of the mead he prophesied the fortunes of the year. If it had decreased, since it was last poured in, scarcity was to be apprehended. If it had increased, there would be abundance. The mead in the cup was poured at the feet of the god and the priest filled it again, praying for prosperity in peace and war. He then drank at a draught the mead which had been dedicated and refilled the horn in the hand of the idol, which remained undisturbed till the next annual feast. Honey cakes and flour were afterwards offered.

Beside Svantovit two other gods of the Slavs were worshipped in Rügen, Forenut, and Rugevit ; but we do not know very much about them. All this is told us by Saxo Grammaticus, who flourished in the twelfth century.

The Christian missionaries, however, determined to throw down this great idol on the island of Rügen. Accordingly when the Danes had got possession of the island, and the inhabitants had promised to accept Christianity, Bishop Absalom betook himself to the temple accompanied by some men armed with axes. The crowds of the inhabitants gathered round them, expecting that they would perish in such a profane attempt. Absalom, however, and his party soon tore down the veil that screened the image ; blows were dealt at the feet of the statue which swayed backward and forward and then fell.

The spectators believed that they saw the demon which had haunted the temple rush from the shrine when the idol fell, in the shape of a little black animal, which at once mysteriously disappeared. Svantovit had been thrown down, but was still a terror to those who looked on, and all

refused to assist in removing it. The inhabitants gazed awe-stricken, while ropes were attached to the idol—in the same way as we read of Perun being treated at Kiev, and it was dragged amid shouts of laughter into the Danish camp, where it was chopped up for firewood.

The Slavs also believed in many mischievous little spirits, like our own Puck, Robin Goodfellow, the German Kobold, the Scotch Kelpie. These led people out of their way, just as Shakspeare makes Puck do in the "Midsummer Night's Dream"; they robbed the granaries of those to whom they were unfriendly, and carried off the spoils to those who had treated them kindly. Elves of this sort are to be found everywhere in the legends current among European peoples. We all remember Chaucer's humorous lament on the decay of the fairies, or Bishop Corbet's merry verses, when he tells us now that these little spirits have departed there will be no reward for good housemaids:—

"Farewell rewards and fairies,
Good housewives now may say;
But now foul sluts in dairies,
Do fare as well as they.
And though they sweep their hearths no less
Than maids were wont to do,
Yet who, of late, for cleanliness
Finds sixpence in her shoe."

We meet with these elves again in the mythology of the Esthonians (a Finnish and not a Slavonic people); they are believed to come out of mouse-holes and secretly to reward the good. Let me call attention to the charming story of the shoemaker and his wife in Grimm's *Hausmärchen*.

The house-spirit in Russia is called the *Domovoi*. He is represented as a hairy dwarf, living in the stove. He goes by different names in Poland and Malo-Russia. The *Domovoi* gives notice of misfortunes which are about to happen to a family, and is heard wailing at night when any member dies, like the Irish *bansíge* (banshee), or fairy woman. He is not always benignant, but sometimes acts the part of an incubus or nightmare, as Queen Mab does in the well-known lines in Shakspeare's "Romeo and Juliet." This incubus is called in Russian *Kikimora*; in Polish, *Mora*.

Among the Lithuanians the stars are considered to be the children of the sun and moon, and are sometimes represented as flocks of sheep, sometimes as horses, upon which divine beings ride.

The milky-way is called "the street of the birds," because there was a superstition that the souls of the dead fluttered along it in the shape of birds. Again the pleasing fancy is found among the Slavs, that each shooting-star marks the end of a life—a very widely-spread piece of folklore, as we know; among other instances, by the charming verses of the French poet, Béranger—*Les étoiles qui filent*—

"Mon enfant, un mortel expire;
Son étoile tombe à l'instant.
Encore une étoile qui file
Qui file, file et disparaît."

The aurora-borealis is supposed to exhibit spirits fighting in the air, and a Lithuanian, on seeing it will even at this day cry out, "the ghosts are fighting."

The personification of the freshness and vigour of spring took its form among the Slavs in the god Pogoda, who was represented as of youthful appearance, and bedecked with blue flowers. Dlugosz, the old Polish chronicler of the fifteenth century, says: "Habitatur et apud illos pro deo temperies, quem sua lingua appellabunt Pogoda quasi bonæ auræ largiter!"

We find winter symbolized in Russian poetry by the Ice-king, who is represented as formidably as he has been drawn by Shelley:—

"For winter came: the wind was his whip;
One choppy finger was on his lip;
He had torn the cataracts from the hills,
And they clanked at his girdle like manacles.

His breath was a chain which without a sound,
The earth and the air and the water bound.
He came fiercely driven in his chariot-throne,
By the tenfold blasts of the Arctic zone."

He is powerfully represented in the fine poem by Nekrasov, who died a few years ago, entitled *Moroz krasni nos*—Red-nosed frost. The story tells us how a poor woman is frozen to death who is taking her husband to burial. I will borrow the translation of Mr. Sumner Smith, the American author:—

"The frost-king came down somewhat lower;
Again waved his mace with much stir,
And whispers more kind than before,
'Art warm?' I am warm, my good sir."

Is warm—but all stiff she is growing;
Has touch'd her the frost-king, the weird;
A breath in her face he is blowing,
And on her sharp needles is showing
From out his huge icy grey beard."

In the pretty little collection of Folk-tales published last year by Miss Hodgetts, entitled, "Tales and Legends from the Land of the Tsar," Morozko, or Jack Frost, as the name may be translated, is thus described:—

"Jack Frost jumped from branch to branch, coming nearer to her. Suddenly he sprang from the tree and stood by her side, his ice-cold fingers touching her shoulders. He was a handsome-looking old man with a long white beard, and curly white locks hanging down his back; he had a kind-looking old face with a good-natured smile on it."

According to Hanusch, there was also a goddess of the winter-weather among the Russians called Zimarzla, *i.e.* the frozen. She had breath of ice, clothes of hoar-frost, a mantle of snow, and a crown of hailstones. The wind was symbolized by the god *Stribog*, and in the Russian poem, "Igor's Expedition against the Polovtses," the winds are spoken of as the grandchildren of Stribog. "See the winds, Stribog's grandchildren, blow hither from the sea like arrows upon the brave hosts of Igor. This god is called

by Dlugosz, Pogwid: "Poloni autem quaslibet vanas creaturas, solem lunam, auram quam Pogwid appellabant cultu divino prosequebantur."

Among the Russians the soul was considered to fly after death from the mouth in the shape of a dove. A superstition alluded to in many Polish and Russian songs, and also to be found among the modern Greeks—perhaps another proof of their Slavonic affinities. On the tomb of Boleslas the Brave (Chrobry), the following words are said to have been inscribed:

"Hic jacet in tumhâ princeps, gloriosa columba."

A whirlwind among the Cossacks of the Ukraine is a token of great misfortune about to come; owls are embodiments of the evil spirit.

In summer early before sunrise, especially on Midsummer day, old women betake themselves to the fields, and drag behind them handkerchiefs spread out, and in this way collect dew. When they come home, they wring the wet pocket-handkerchief; the moisture is put into a bottle and used for washing the faces of children. The superstition is that in this way they will become as beautiful as angels. This custom is also found in England. When the bride goes to be married, she must take parsley and bread with her, so that evil spirits may not bewitch her. At home the newly-married pair have a spoon given to them full of honey, which they must eat so that concord may prevail between them. An excellent description of Russian marriage ceremonies is given by Mr. Ralston in his *Folk-songs of Russia*.

When in Russia a new cottage is built, even at the present day, the owner shuts a cock inside. If it crows during the night, it is a lucky sign; if, however, the contrary happens, the owner will not dwell in it, for he is convinced that the evil spirit has taken possession of it.

The Slavs still believe that all ghosts must disappear when the crowing of the cock is heard. You will remember the lines of Hamlet where Bernardo says,—

"It was about to speak, when the cock crew."

To which Horatio answers,—

"And then it started like a guilty thing
Upon a fearful summons. I have heard
The cock, that is the trumpet to the morn,
Doth with his lofty and shrill-sounding throat
Awake the god of day; and at his warning,
Whether in sea or fire, in earth or air,
The extravagant and erring spirit hies
To his confine."

When the bridegroom brings the bride home and either the horse is tired or a wheel breaks, it is a sign of very bad luck.

When after a severe winter in Russia or Poland wolves have become so bold that they venture to attack human beings, the common people think they are men bewitched into wolves who come to seek the blood of children. Here we have the old story of the were-wolves, just such as

Herodotus told us of the Neuri, merely repeating a very ancient tradition, that they were in the habit of becoming wolves every year for a few days. These Neuri were in all probability a Slavonic tribe, who occupied the territory which corresponds to a certain extent with the modern Volhynia. The word *were* in the compound *were-wolf*, is really one of the old Aryan words for man *uyras* in Lithuanian, *vir* in Latin, and in Welsh *gwr*.

For another instance of belief in were-wolves, so widely spread, see the Irish version of the *Historia Britonum* of Nennius, a curious passage in which may be translated as follows :—

"There are certain people in Eri, namely, the race of Laighne Faelaidh, in Ossory; they pass into the forms of wolves whenever they please, and kill cattle according to the custom of wolves, and they quit their own bodies; and if they are wounded while abroad, the same wounds will be on their bodies in their houses, and the raw flesh devoured while abroad will be in their teeth."

The leanness of children was attributed to witches, Boginky, who stole fat children and substituted thin ones for them.

The Slavs had also spirits of fire and water. Procopius tells us that they worshipped rivers (*ἀρβουρι μέντοι καὶ ποταμούς*). Vuk Stephanovich, who was the first to collect Serbian ballads and to write of the superstitions of his country, tells us of the Dodola feast, which is connected with this primitive *cultus* of water. When a drought has continued for a long time, a young girl is entirely clothed in a dress of grass, herbs, and flowers. She goes from house to house, and in the midst of dances is constantly drenched with water. She is called Dodola, and the song which her companions sing round her is given in the first volume of the national songs of Serbia, collected by Vuk,—

"Nasha Doda, Boga molí
Our Doda, pray thou to God."

Paton, in his travels in Serbia, gives us a good description of this festival; he tells us that the custom used to be observed in the Serbian districts in Hungary, but it has now been forbidden by the priests.

The worship of rivers may be traced in many other countries. For example, we know from Herodotus, that father of ancient folk-lore and ancient sagas, who observed everything with the keenest curiosity, and wrote about what he *did* see like a poet—we know, I say, that rivers were held sacred by the ancient Persians, and we find the ancient Greeks in the habit of consecrating locks of their hair to rivers. A river seems so full of life and continuity, to carry with it such power and vitality, that we need not be surprised at this ancient and picturesque superstition.

The Slavs believed in the existence of water-nymphs; the Russians called them *rusalki*; a pretty word about the derivation of which there has been a great deal of dispute, but the subject is too special and academic to be introduced here. According to one form of the superstition, these spirits were the souls of unbaptized children or drowned

women. They correspond to the Nereids and Sirens of the Greeks; the Lorelei of the Germans, and the Neckar of the Swedes. They allured travellers to their destruction, and I need not tell you of the many graceful poems which have been written in the literatures of all countries upon this beautiful superstition.

You have probably, most of you, read the pretty German story of La Motte Fouqué, called "Undine," and my late friend, Sir Samuel Ferguson, in that fine poem of his, of which we may so safely predict that it will be read as long as the English language is spoken, viz., the "Forging of the Anchor," tells us how the anchor may descend,—

"Haply in a cove,
Shell-strown, and consecrate of old to some Undine's love,
To find the long-haired mermaids."

In the Ukraine these water-nymphs are called Mavki, and in Poland Wili, and upon these latter many beautiful poems have been written by Adam Mickiewicz, the national poet of Poland.

The Vilas, as they are styled among the Serbs, play a very important part in the mythology of that country. In Serbian poetry, "fair as a mountain-vila," is a favourite epithet applied to a woman, and "swift as a vila" is said of a horse. Many of the songs in the collection of Vuk Stephanovich are consecrated to Vilas; among the Bulgarians they are called Samovilas, or solitary, and frequently exhibit very malignant characteristics, and are jealous of and hostile to female beauty. The Polish Wilis had their dances, traces of which remained in magic-rings, as with us. They took severe vengeance upon those who disturbed their dances. Sometimes the Samovilas marry mortals and bear them children; just as in the story so beautifully told by Leyden, the Scotch poet, in his pretty verses entitled, "The Maid of Colonsay."

"And ever as the year returns,
The charm-bound sailors know the day;
For sadly still the mermaid mourns
The lovely chief of Colonsay."

Beside the mermaids there are the Tsar morskoi, or King of the Sea, and the Vodni muzh or man of the water, and the Vodna zhena or woman of the water, who in the same way as the *rusalki* lure people to their destruction. Another form of the same superstition is that of the Kelpie in Scotland. Besides this *Vodni muzh*, or vodiani, as he is sometimes called, there is the Topielich, who causes people to be drowned, and Zmok, or water-dragon, who is able at other times to appear in the form of a bird.

Before leaving these water-spirits, I must mention that the Bohemians, before Christianity was introduced among them, used to offer sacrifices to rivers. Nestor also tells that the *cultus* of lakes and fountains prevailed among the ancient Poles. Mickiewicz, who has already been mentioned, one of whose chief pleasures it was to clothe in charming verse the old traditions of his country, has written a beautiful poem on a magic lake near Nowogródek in Lithuania, the place of his birth.

Those familiar with the folk-songs of the Russian people, especially those in vogue among the Cossacks, will remember the many songs upon rivers; for instance, the Don, who is called by the playful name of Don Ivanovich, or son of John, and to him the epithet *tikh* or quiet is always applied.

Beside water-spirits the Slavs also had their spirits of the mountains, like the Oreads of the Greeks; among the Serbs or Lusatian Wends, a small Slavonic people inhabiting parts of Saxony and Prussia, they were called *Horzoni* (from *hora*, a mountain). I have already spoken of the sacred groves and trees, calling attention at the same time to the wide-spread influence of this *cultus*. It is found almost everywhere. In the regions of the Caucasus, where the population is not of Slavonic origin, we have repeated stories of sacred trees, and a very interesting paper on the subject was published a few years ago in the Transactions of the Caucasian Geographical Society. There has been frequently mixed up with this worship of trees the idea that some human life depended upon them. Readers of the classics will remember the shrieks that issued from the tree that was being cut down in the *Æneid*, when it was discovered that it was really a man, Polydorus, who had been changed into a tree. To the ancients the scruple about cutting down a venerable tree would be stronger than to us.

Plants of all kinds played a conspicuous part in the mythology of the Slavs, as would naturally be the case with people who were so purely agricultural, and all whose occupations made them devotedly attached to rural life. Among the spirits who frequented the woods was a malicious female goblin, called *Pšipolnitza*. She was said by an old author to go about the fields while reapers were busy and to break the arms and legs of those who were working. The Russians called their male forest demons *liashi*, or the men of the woods, a kind of satyrs, just such as we find described in *Æsop's* fables chatting familiarly with woodmen. We know that the ancients firmly believed in these creatures.

In that quaint book, Baddeley's "Historical Meditations," published about the beginning of the seventeenth century, we get the following strange story:—

"Plutarch writeth that there was a Satyr taken when Sulla determined to pass with a fleet of fifteen hundred sail from Dyrrachium to Brundisium. The city of Apollonia (saith he) is not far from Dyrrachium; and hard by Apollonia is a park dedicated to the nymphs, where, within a green valley and a fair meadow, there issue forth, here and there, certain bubbles of fire, which flow continually; and they say that a satyr was taken there asleep, being such in every respect as painters and image-makers shape him. So he was brought to Sulla, and being asked by many truchmen [interpreters] who he was, he answered nothing that one could understand but only cast forth a harsh voice, mingled with the neighing of a horse and the crying of a goat, which Sulla wondered at, and, not able to abide

it, made him be taken away out of his sight, as a monstrous thing." According to the Russians, the birds and beasts of the forest are under the protection of these *lieshi*, and according to the treatment which they receive, they assist or impede sportsmen. The woods echo with the mysterious voices of these creatures, and sometimes they carry off maidens to be their wives. With them must be probably classed the demon named Polkan—half-man and half-beast—who lived in the wood. The *lieshi* had the power of changing their stature at their will: they could walk in the midst of the grass and be no taller than the blades; if they went into the woods, they were as tall as the trees. They are prettily alluded to in one of the poems of Koltsov—"Dom Liesnika"—(The House of the Woodman), who keeps the door of his house fast shut that the spirits of the woods may not enter.

A superstitious veneration was shown for the cuckoo, and in one of the Serbian ballads the soul of a dead man goes into a cuckoo. In the Malo-Russian ballads the cuckoo is considered a bird of grief. The swallow was considered holy: it was the messenger of spring and love, and it was allowed to nestle in temples and the images of the gods among northern people, as it was among the ancients. Both the cock and raven play a great part in all Slavonic legends: they are supposed to be messengers of the gods; perhaps this is one of the reasons why ghosts departed at the crowing of the cock.

There are frequent mentions of serpents in the old Bulgarian folk-songs: Hartknoch, who lived at the end of the seventeenth century, says they were worshipped among the old Prussians; and we know from Herberstein, the traveller of the sixteenth century, that the pagan Lithuanians worshipped lizards. The superstition about vampires (in Russian, *upiri*) largely prevails in all Slavonic countries.

Diseases were supposed to be conveyed by the maiden of the plague, called Chuma. She was thought to go from house to house, wrapped in a white veil and carrying the disease with her. Those smitten are supposed to have held converse with her. She is called by the Serbs *Kuga*; by the Lusatians, *Smernisa*, or the goddess of death. She only enjoys her power, however, till the beginning of the new year.

The Russians have also their giants and stories of fights with giants, reminding us of our Jack the Giant Killer, as, in the tale of Sviatogor, who does not feel that mountains have been thrown upon him. Ilya Muromets is the great genial giant of many a legend. His blows, however, can hardly arouse Sviatogor from his dream: the giant thinks that they are only pebbles falling upon him. At the third blow he turns and says to the hero: "You are brave as a man; remain brave among them; you will never be able to measure your strength with me. See what my size is; the earth itself cannot contain me; I have at last found this mountain and rested upon it." The bilinas are filled with his magnificent exploits either alone or with Sviatogor. On one occasion he visits the father of the latter

hero, who, being blind, wishes to touch the hand of Ilya, to see whether it has the champion's true firmness and strength. Ilya takes a piece of iron, makes it red hot, and offers it to the veteran, who, grasping it so tightly that he makes the sparks fly in all directions, exclaims, "Thou hast a strong hand and hot blood; thou art a true hero."

Of course as the Slavs have their giants, they have also their dwarfs—such as a kind of Tom Thumb, Palchick, and other names. A formidable demon is the Vii, whose glance reduces the person who meets him to ashes. He is introduced into a very striking tale by Gogol, the eminent novelist.

A curious belief with regard to the dead, was that on a certain day it was possible to see the forms of all those who were destined to die during the year. This superstition has been introduced into Russian poetry, and perhaps some of my hearers may remember it in the first work of the great novelist, Turgueniev "*Zapiski Okhotnika*" (Memoirs of a Sportsman).

I have attempted in the present lecture, limited as I am by time, to give you a short sketch of some of the leading beliefs of the ancient Slavs, before Christianity was introduced among them. No one has yet succeeded in drawing out a complete system of their pantheon, if I may so speak. The materials for its reconstruction are scanty—for the Russians we have the allusions in Nestor; for the Slavs on the Baltic, the chroniclers whom I have already quoted—Thietmar, Adam of Bremen, and Helmold; for the Poles, Dlugosz; for the Bohemians, to a less extent, Cosmas. Besides these we have the valuable *bilini*, or old songs, and the many allusions in proverbs, etc.

Those acquainted with the Slavonic languages know that the word for God in all of them differs from that in use among other Indo-European peoples. It is *Bog*, and is connected with the Zend word *bogha*: traces of the same root are to be found in the word *bogati*, rich; *bogatsvo*, wealth.

But the question will naturally suggest itself: What sacrifices did the Slavs offer to their gods? We hear of men and sheep being offered upon the hills and in the woods were the images of the gods were erected, and fruits of the field were also brought. Of human sacrifices we hear but little, although they seem to have occurred occasionally among the offerings made to their gods by the Baltic Slavs. We do not find anything so terrible among these peoples as occurred among the Mexicans, for example, who tore out the hearts of their victims and placed them in the mouth of their idol Huizilopochtli? The Slavs seem on the whole to have been a gentle people, living quietly in their communes with a very democratic form of government, although no doubt some of the stories told of their pastoral simplicity in ancient times are exaggerations.

It is not a little curious that the titles in use among them at a later period are all of foreign origin. Tsar is of course Cæsar, and was a title not assumed by the sovereign in Russia till the middle of the sixteenth century. The word for king, *kral* or *korol*, was simply derived from Charle-

magne, or Charles the Great, as he is now more often called. We must remember that the German form of Charles is Karl (really signifying a manly fellow), and indeed the word has been preserved in that signification in Scandinavian. The Russian word for Prince, *Kniaz*, is really connected with the German *König*, and we shall see the connection more easily, if we can bear in mind that the old form of *Kniaz* has a nasal in it. The word which was once used in Russia for a nobleman, *boyar*, has been shown by Miklosich to have been of Turkish origin. Bearing these facts in mind, we shall not be astonished to see that among the ancient Slavs there was no particular priestly caste. The office seems to have belonged to the heads of the families and tribes. In the same way there was no priestly caste among the ancient Romans, nor indeed has there ever been one among the Mahomedans.

According to some writers, the dead were buried under the threshold of their houses, but in many places vast sepulchres are discovered. From the early Arabian writers we learn that the Slavs who dwelt in the southern part of the country burnt their dead, and that widows were occasionally immolated with their husbands. This may have been the custom with some tribes, but burial must also have commonly prevailed, as we find by the vast *Kurgans*, especially in the South of Russia, where the bones of the warrior are found resting with those of his wife and attendants.

Herodotus thus describes the interment of a chief among the ancient Scythians, and we feel pretty sure that these Scythians included some Slavonic tribes :

"They who have the care of the corpse carry it with them to another of the tribes which are under the Scythian rule followed by those whom they first visited. On completing the circuit of all the tribes under their sway they find themselves in the country of the Gerrhi, who are the most remote of all, and so they come to the tombs of their kings. There the body of the dead king is laid in the grave prepared for it, stretched upon a mattress, spears are fixed in the ground on either side of the corpse and beams stretched across it to form a roof, which is covered with a thatching of osier twigs. In the open space round the body of the king they bury one of his wives, first killing her by strangling, and also his cup-bearer, his cook, his groom, his lacquey, his messenger, some of his horses, firstlings of all his other possessions and some golden cups, for they use neither silver nor brass. After this they set to work and raise a vast mound above the grave, all of them vying with each other and seeking to make it as tall as possible."

This may well have been the grave of an ancient Slav, and we need not be at all puzzled by finding that Herodotus uses the word king, for he would apply that expression to the head man of any tribe. Tombs of this sort have frequently been excavated in Russia, the most celebrated being that which was found a few years ago near Kertch, containing many golden ornaments and a beautiful electron vase now preserved in the museum of the Hermitage at St. Petersburg.

On the whole there seems good reason to think that the ancient Slavs believed in the immortality of the soul, although Thietmar says, "*cum morte temporali omnia putant finire.*" But that the early Slavs thought the soul is independent of the body, is proved by their idea that when a man is asleep his soul might quit his body and take various shapes. Thus they personified the soul under different forms, at one time as smoke, at another as fire, at another in the form of a butterfly. The belief that the soul after death wanders about its earthly habitation is shown even to the present time by the custom of putting cakes at the window for the dead at certain feasts.

We constantly find mention in old Russian books of wizards, and sooth-saying was very much practised among them. But the great places from which they procured their wizards appear to have been Lapland and Finland. Lapland enjoyed considerable reputation for sorcerers, and was at a later period of the world's history what Thessaly was at an earlier. Milton, we must remember, speaks of the Lapland witches, at whose charm the moon became eclipsed, and one of the strangest scenes in history is that in which we learn how Ivan the Terrible had witches fetched from Lapland in order that they might be consulted about his death, reminding us of the superstitious terrors of Louis XI. The whole scene is given with vigour in the diary of Sir Jerome Horsey, the English ambassador who has left us so vivid a picture of Ivan's reign. He tells us that three score witches were brought from out the north, where there is store, between Cholmogori and Lapland. They were carefully directed and daily visited and attended by Bogdan Bielski, the Emperor's favourite, who went to them to receive their divinations. We can also find what curious superstitious beliefs the Russians had from the *Stoglav*, or Book of the Hundred Chapters, compiled in the reign of Ivan IV. with the view of arranging the discipline of the Church, education and other matters.

It will thus have been seen that Slavonic religion was more or less a worship of the forms of nature, the phenomena of the sky being pre-eminent. Man in his ruder state sees these strange forces around him, which he cannot interpret, and attempts to propitiate them. Each element has its deity—the lakes, the rivers, the groves, and the mountains, teem with them, but the idolatry of the Slavs did not take the graceful form of the anthropomorphism of the Greeks, whose marvellous power of idealizing the human body has never been equalled. One reason generally assigned why no specimen of the old gods of the Slavs has been preserved is that they were ordinarily of wood, and the Slavs do not seem to have built them any elaborate temples. They were, no doubt, often like the ancient Druids among ourselves, contented with the grand temples of the forests, where by silence and darkness religion was made mysterious.

But there was to be an end to their simple worship; in the ninth century came the great Slavonic apostles, Cyril and Methodius—according to some, Greeks of Salonica; but they may have been Græcised Slavs, for otherwise

how can we explain their readiness with the Slavonic tongue, which they could hardly have *acquired* so perfectly?

The Bible was translated by them, and an alphabet invented, based mainly upon the Greek. The Russians, Bulgarians, and Serbs received their Christianity from the Greek or Orthodox Church, and have remained members of that communion to the present day. The Poles, Bohemians, and Slovenes accepted their faith from Latin missionaries, and are at this day Roman Catholics, save where some vestiges of the great Protestant struggles in those countries are still preserved, and in no part of Europe was the contest keener than there; but how Protestantism was introduced there, and why it has been so nearly stamped out, cannot be told in the present lecture, although it is one of the most startling episodes in the history of the progress of thought and religious freedom.

We may say in conclusion that the simple beliefs of the Slavs rendered them easily inclined to receive Christianity. There was no powerful religious caste to view with disfavour the new doctrines by finding itself dispossessed of power and influence. Their religion was purely of a domestic kind, and was not a state engine. There were no kings or powerful chiefs who were supposed to have the special protection of heaven. They seem to have been fairly tolerant, for in the treaties between the Greeks and Russians, the latter invoke their deities by the side of the God of the Christians. Christianity was not introduced as the cult of any conquering race, and carried forward at the point of the sword. Among the Bohemians, Poles, Russians, Serbs, and Bulgarians, it was introduced by such excellent workers as Cyril and Methodius, Adalbert and Bishop Otho of Bamberg. The accounts some of these missionaries gave of them were very favourable, and testify to their gentleness and simplicity. The biographer of Bishop Otho, whose very interesting life has been printed in the *Monumenta Polonia Historica* of Bielowski, remarks of the Pomeranians, the Slavonic tribe once dwelling on the coasts of the Baltic, that they never found it necessary to keep anything under lock and key. They were much astonished, he writes, when they beheld the chests and trunks of the bishop locked.

Among such a people the gentle doctrines of Christianity, as might be expected, were easily diffused, and to this day the Slavs have remained an essentially religious people. The devotion of the Russian to his Church is evident, wherever we travel in the country. Nothing strikes the stranger more than the bands of religious pilgrims continually wandering to visit sacred shrines such as that of Kiev and the Pestcherskaya Lavra, for instance, where we find large hostels built to receive these *bogomoltsi*, or pilgrims, for a trifling cost. Of course, it is very easy to sneer at all this; but Leroy-Beaulieu, whom I have quoted on a previous occasion, has said very plainly that in his opinion true feeling underlies this worship. If these and other customs are reliques of paganism, then the Italians, Spaniards, and even the Irish may be called pagans. The same is the case with the Pole,

who has his shrines for pilgrimages. Among the Bohemians the battle between Protestantism and Catholicism was fought in the keenest manner in the days of Huss and Zizka.

But the subject of my lecture is strictly the old religious beliefs of the Slavs, and these are now only remembered in quaint customs or fragments of old songs or proverbs. It may be safely said that no peoples on the earth have richer collections than they of these interesting traditions. For a long time the Russians did not collect their folklore; for when the educated classes were occupied in learning the language and aping the manners of the French, it was not likely that they would pay any attention to these rude monuments of village lore. But things are now altered, and no branch of human learning is more studied than the popular one. For estimating the wealth of Slavonic folklore, you must betake yourself to the pages of the late Mr. Ralston and Mr. Wratislaw. The *bilini*, or legendary poems, are not much known in this country; a few have been translated. The proverbs, however, are wholly neglected; This is much to be regretted, because they throw great light upon popular life.

I will therefore now conclude my brief sketch by hoping that you will not leave without taking with you some interest in this rather strange and out-of-the-way subject. It has not been in my power to give a perfect sketch of the Slavonic Pantheon, if I may use the term. I have, however, given you some broad and general outlines which I hope will not prove unserviceable.

how can we explain their readiness with the Slavonic tongue, which they could hardly have *acquired* so perfectly?

The Bible was translated by them, and an alphabet invented, based mainly upon the Greek. The Russians, Bulgarians, and Serbs received their Christianity from the Greek or Orthodox Church, and have remained members of that communion to the present day. The Poles, Bohemians, and Slovenes accepted their faith from Latin missionaries, and are at this day Roman Catholics, save where some vestiges of the great Protestant struggles in those countries are still preserved, and in no part of Europe was the contest keener than there; but how Protestantism was introduced there, and why it has been so nearly stamped out, cannot be told in the present lecture, although it is one of the most startling episodes in the history of the progress of thought and religious freedom.

We may say in conclusion that the simple beliefs of the Slavs rendered them easily inclined to receive Christianity. There was no powerful religious caste to view with disfavour the new doctrines by finding itself dispossessed of power and influence. Their religion was purely of a domestic kind, and was not a state engine. There were no kings or powerful chiefs who were supposed to have the special protection of heaven. They seem to have been fairly tolerant, for in the treaties between the Greeks and Russians, the latter invoke their deities by the side of the God of the Christians. Christianity was not introduced as the cult of any conquering race, and carried forward at the point of the sword. Among the Bohemians, Poles, Russians, Serbs, and Bulgarians, it was introduced by such excellent workers as Cyril and Methodius, Adalbert and Bishop Otho of Bamberg. The accounts some of these missionaries gave of them were very favourable, and testify to their gentleness and simplicity. The biographer of Bishop Otho, whose very interesting life has been printed in the *Monumenta Polonia Historica* of Bielowski, remarks of the Pomeranians, the Slavonic tribe once dwelling on the coasts of the Baltic, that they never found it necessary to keep anything under lock and key. They were much astonished, he writes, when they beheld the chests and trunks of the bishop locked.

Among such a people the gentle doctrines of Christianity, as might be expected, were easily diffused, and to this day the Slavs have remained an essentially religious people. The devotion of the Russian to his Church is evident, wherever we travel in the country. Nothing strikes the stranger more than the bands of religious pilgrims continually wandering to visit sacred shrines such as that of Kiev and the Pestcherskaya Lavra, for instance, where we find large hostels built to receive these *bogomoltsi*, or pilgrims, for a trifling cost. Of course, it is very easy to sneer at all this; but Leroy-Beaulieu, whom I have quoted on a previous occasion, has said very plainly that in his opinion true feeling underlies this worship. If these and other customs are reliques of paganism, then the Italians, Spaniards, and even the Irish may be called pagans. The same is the case with the Pole,

who has his shrines for pilgrimages. Among the Bohemians the battle between Protestantism and Catholicism was fought in the keenest manner in the days of Huss and Zizka.

But the subject of my lecture is strictly the old religious beliefs of the Slavs, and these are now only remembered in quaint customs or fragments of old songs or proverbs. It may be safely said that no peoples on the earth have richer collections than they of these interesting traditions. For a long time the Russians did not collect their folklore; for when the educated classes were occupied in learning the language and aping the manners of the French, it was not likely that they would pay any attention to these rude monuments of village lore. But things are now altered, and no branch of human learning is more studied than the popular one. For estimating the wealth of Slavonic folklore, you must betake yourself to the pages of the late Mr. Ralston and Mr. Wratislaw. The *bilini*, or legendary poems, are not much known in this country; a few have been translated. The proverbs, however, are wholly neglected; This is much to be regretted, because they throw great light upon popular life.

I will therefore now conclude my brief sketch by hoping that you will not leave without taking with you some interest in this rather strange and out-of-the-way subject. It has not been in my power to give a perfect sketch of the Slavonic Pantheon, if I may use the term. I have, however, given you some broad and general outlines which I hope will not prove unserviceable.

TEUTONIC HEATHENDOM.

By F. YORK POWELL, M.A.

It can hardly be denied that there is an enduring interest in the subject of this lecture—the beliefs of the heathen Teutons. No one who cares for the history of the thought of our race but must feel an interest in tracing back to their springs the courses of such mighty rivers. But though on this voyage of discovery the way becomes darker and darker, and difficulties crowd around as one nears these sources, yet some part of the voyage is already mapped out.

The material investigation existing includes, first, *written evidence*, which, apart from the fragmentary notices preserved by Tacitus, Dio, Velleius, Florus, the Augustan historians, Marcellinus, and other classical authors, together with the scraps furnished by later Christian chroniclers, such as Eginhard, Prudentius, Asser, and Adam of Bremen, consists mainly of exact and excellent accounts of heathen ways and customs, preserved by an Icelandic priest of noble family, named Are, born in 1067, who took a great interest in the antiquities of his race, and wrote books (c. 1100–25), in which are preserved a number of most curious traditions.

Then there is a collection of old songs or lays, the so-called *Older Edda*, which, it is believed, was compiled in the twelfth century, probably in the Orkney or Shetland Islands, by some Iclander who retained an interest in the old heathen legends which but for him had died out of memory. He has preserved some twenty or thirty fragmentary poems. The *Younger Edda* (really a *gradus* or poetic dictionary) was compiled by Snorre Sturlasson, 1178–1241, the Icelandic historian, and other scholars and poets for the benefit of those who intended to compose vernacular verse; for Icelandic poets, even after the acceptance of Christianity, were accustomed (like our own poets of last century) to make allusions to old mythological gods.

Next in value comes the Latin *Historia Danica* of Saxo, the monk of Lund (about 1215), who not only wrote a good history of his own times but out of ancient songs and traditions—many furnished to him by Icelanders and persons familiar with other western Scandinavian colonies—put together a curious account of the mythic days of Denmark, working after the fashion of our Geoffrey of Monmouth.¹

¹ The chief works of Are, *Landnámabók* (The Book of Settlements), *Libellus Islan-dorum*, and the *Story of the Conversion of Iceland*, have been edited by the late Dr. Vig-fusson with translation, and will shortly appear. The *Elder Edda* poems have been edited and translated by the same in *Corpus Poeticum Boreale* (Oxford, 1883). The first two parts of the prose or *Younger Edda* have been several times translated into English by Sir G.

Besides these main authorities there are a vast number of valuable little stories, hints, and allusions to heathen habits and beliefs, scattered through the vast mediæval literature of England, France, and Germany. These have been for the most part collected and arranged in his masterly and delightful way by Jacob Grimm in his *Teutonic Mythology*, now accessible to all in Mr. Stallybrass's excellent and accurate translation. This book may be supplemented by M. Rydberg's study of Saxo, entitled *Teutonic Mythology*, and translated by Rasmus B. Anderson (Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1889).

Jacob Grimm and his brother William also set the example of collecting and using *oral evidence*, fairy tales and folk-lore of all kinds, which still linger upon the lips of the people in country places, as material for the history of mythology and of the life and thought of the old. Much has been done by Germans, Icelanders, Scandinavians, and much by such Englishmen as Halliwell and Campbell, to work this great mine of popular tradition; and recent scholars, especially Mr. A. Lang, Mr. Nutt, and Mr. Frazer, have shown the use to which it can be put in elucidating some of the more important problems of the history of man's past.

Such being, roughly, our materials, how are we to study them? What trains of thought may be most profitably followed? First of all, it must be acknowledged, that it is useless to attempt to solve the problem by one key, to explain the religion of the past by one principle.

Our early Teuton forefathers were influenced by *anthropomorphism* and *animism*, and thought that inanimate objects, as stones, stars, and the elements, and organisms such as trees, fishes, birds, and beasts, were possessed of spirits akin to their own; they believed in *dreams*, and used them largely as a means of foretelling the future; they *worshipped the dead*, and treated their deceased ancestors as gods; they held the *doctrine of correspondences*, *i.e.*, that things which had a superficial likeness had a deeper resemblance—from which last doctrine there grew up some of the earlier systems of medicine; while the *wisard*, with his use of hypnotism, mania, poison, jugglery, and medicine, was dreaded and sometimes punished. In fact, there is hardly a superstitious use or observance, which a modern missionary may note in the barbarous Central African or South American or Polynesian tribe he is endeavouring to civilize and raise, but we may find its analogue among the practices or beliefs of our Teutonic forefathers. These things are a part of the general history of mankind, they make up a mental stage through which progressive nations pass—a stage of false but shrewd reasoning, of clever but mistaken guesses, of erroneous but plausible conclusions, a stage such as individually we all go through in infancy and childhood. Our minds are perhaps of little better quality than our ancestors', but we profit by the vast mass of accepted, tested, and recorded

Dasent and others. *Axe's Ynglinga-tal* is translated (from a Danish version) by Laing in his *Saga-kings of Norway*, and by R. B. Anderson. Mr. O. Elton is now translating Saxo's *History* for the Folk-lore Society.

information which they had not. We start higher up the ladder, and therefore ought to get a little higher on the climb to knowledge.

Again, it is important that we should at once throw aside the idea that there was any *system*, any organized pantheon, in the religion of these peoples. Their tribes were small and isolated, and each had its own peculiar gods and observances, although the mould of each faith was somewhat similar. Hence there were varieties of religious customs and ideas among the Goths, Swedes, Saxons, and Angles. The same thing was the case in ancient Greece, and it must occur in all civilizations at the stage before small clans and tribes have combined into great leagues and centralized nations. Hence we shall find many parallel versions of leading myths. Many alternative forms of the same tale, many widespread legends attributed to different persons in different places. Then, too, one perceives that round the actual living flesh-and-blood hero of the day the stories of former heroes crystallize. Thus the stories related about King Arthur once belonged to earlier heroes—Gwyn and others; precisely as I was once told by a friend that in a country part of Italy he had heard a story of Garibaldi, which has been referred for many hundreds of years to an old Semitic hero. Garibaldi was in the hills with a small band of men, pursued closely by the cruel Whitecoats. The fugitives had been marching hour after hour in the burning sun without a drop of water; it was high noon, and in the agony of thirst several of the General's little band threw themselves down on the ground declaring they could go no farther. Garibaldi ordered a little mountain gun he had to be brought up. This gun he aimed himself at a conspicuous cliff, not far off, and fired. Scarcely had the smoke of the gun passed away when a glittering thread of water was seen trickling from the rock precisely where the shot had smitten it. The thirsty Redshirts drank their fill, marched on refreshed, and escaped their foes. In the light of such a story it is easy to see how upon Theodric, the famous East Gothic king, there descended legends which, as Professor Rhys has pointed out, belonged to an earlier and divine Theodric; how upon Ragnar the Northman, upon the Beowulf Jute, and upon Sigfredos-Arminius the Cheruscan there have fastened tales of dragon-slaying which belonged to more mythical heroes.

With such preliminary note, one may proceed to touch on some of the beliefs of the heathen Teuton world. With regard to *cosmogony*, three or four different opinions have reached us, the oldest, as we should suppose, being extremely infantile. It was, that originally there was nothing but a huge giant, who nearly filled all space. Some heroic persons killed this giant, and out of his body made the world, sun, moon, etc. At first such stories were firmly believed in, then doubted, and afterwards told to children as a fairy tale. They are, of course, common among Aryan nations.

There were also tales of the earth-goddess and the sky-god, of the god of day, of the sun-goddess and the moon-god, very like those in the classic

Polynesian and Semitic mythologies. There was also a tale of the first man and woman, being made by the gods out of two trees, *ash* and *elder*, that grew on the sea-shore. Kings and heroes were always supposed to be the actual descendants of the gods, and became gods themselves when they died.

The world was looked upon as a huge plain, a belief which existed in Greece and other countries. Man lived near the edge of this earth-plain, outside was the ocean-stream, as in Homer's cosmogony. Beyond this again was a belt of frozen land, the boundaries of which were indefinite, where dwelt giants and demons.

All the *primitive arts* and *culture* came from the underworld, won by the clever tricks and devices of heroes. Swans and bees came from a paradise, somewhere underground, where the Fates lived. Sheep and oxen were also believed to be gifts from the underworld. Eager was the sea-god and Ran his wife, Rode the wind-god, and Loke the evil-plotting giant who brings trouble among gods and men. Man obtained *inspiration* by some hero stealing from the giants or dwarves a certain potent liquid, which gave to him that quaffed it the power of poetry, prophecy, and memory. As to the origin of *fire*, Woden was the Prometheus of the Teutonic race, as Heimdal was its culture-god and Sheaf the Triptolemos who taught men to sow corn and make bread. Frey and Tew were the chief gods of the Swedes and Franks, Thunder (Thórr) of the Reams and Throwends in West Norway.

As a good example of the form in which the legends of the gods have come down, I give here an exact translation of one of the most famous of the Eddic lays, dating probably from the ninth century. It is entitled "The Story of Thrym," and runs thus:—

Wroth was Wing-Thor when he wakened,
And missed that mighty hammer of his;
He began to shake his beard, he began to toss his locks.¹
The Son of Earth was groping about him;
And this was the foremost word that he spoke—
"Hearken now, Loke, to what I am telling thee,²
A thing never heard of on earth afore time
Or in heaven above. The god's hammer³ is stolen!"

They walked to the town of Freya the fair,
And this was the foremost word that he spoke—
"Thy feather-fell wilt thou lend me, Freya,
That I may be able my hammer to find?"
Then spake Freya: "Yea, I would give it thee though it were golden,
And grant it to thee although it were silver."

Then away fled Loke, the feather-fell rattled
Till he won out of the town of the gods,

¹ Thor has long red beard and locks, with a dark scar between his brows.

² Loke is a cunning mischievous god. It is his fault that the hammer got into Thrym's keeping.

³ The hammer is of stone or bronze, short-hafted. It was made for Thor by the dwarves.

And till he won into the land of the Ettins [giants].
Thrym, the giants' king, on a grave-mound was sitting,
Plaiting the leashes of gold for his greyhound;
Trimming the manes of his horses so even.

Spake Thrym: "How goes it with the gods? How goes it with the Elves?
Why art thou come alone to the land of the Ettins?"

Loke spake: "It goes ill with the gods! It goes ill with the Elves!
Hast thou hidden the Charioteer's hammer?"

Thrym spake: "I have hidden the Charioteer's hammer
Eight leagues deep beneath the earth.

No man shall ever get it again,
Save he fetch me Freya to wife."

Then away fled Loke, the feather-fell rattled

Till he won out of the land of the Ettins,

Till he won into the town of the gods.

There met him Thor, in the midst of the gate,

And this was the foremost word that he spake:—

"Hast thou tidings for thy errand?

Tell me all thy tidings aloft as thou fliest!

For he that speaks sitting oft stumbles in speech,

And he that speaks lying down oft tricks men with lies."

Loke spake: "I have tidings for my errand.

Thrym hath thine hammer—the king of the giants.

No man shall ever get it again

Save he fetch him Freya to wife."

They walked to the town of Freya the fair,

And this was the foremost word that he spake:—

"Wrap thee, Freya, in the bride's veil;

We two must drive¹ to the land of the Ettins."

Wroth grew Freya then, and snorted with rage,

The hall of the gods all trembled beneath,

The Brisings' great necklace² snapped asunder.

Freya spake: "Sure I should seem man-maddest of women,
If I drove with thee to the land of the Ettins!"

Then all the gods held a moot together,

And all the goddesses a parley;

The mighty gods took council together

How they might win back the Charioteer's hammer.

Then spake Hamdal, the whitest of gods,³

Great foresight had he, as all the Wanes have:—

"Let us wrap Thor in the bride's veil!

Let him have the Brisings' great necklace!

Let the bunch of keys rattle at his girdle,

And a woman's coat fall about his knees!

Let us fasten the broad-stones⁴ on his breast,

And wind the hood deftly about his head!"

Then up spake Thor the doughty god:—

"Lewd fellow, surely, the gods will call me,

If I let myself be wrapped in a bride's veil!"

Then up spake Loke Laufey's son:—

"Spare such speaking, Thor!

Soon shall the Ettins be dwelling in Godboro',

Save thou canst win thine hammer back!"

¹ The driving in a car was a necessary part of the wedding ceremony.

² The Brising's necklace was a dwarf-made magic necklace that, like Eriphyle's necklace, was a curse to any mortal that owned it, and like the *cestus* that Hera borrowed, a love-chain when the goddess wore it.

³ Hamdal, the ancestor of men, the bringer of culture from the underworld, warder of the gods, a huge white ram-headed deity with gold teeth, he sits over the rainbow-snake. He belonged to a set of the gods called Wanes, as did Niord and Frey.

⁴ These are the two ornamented brooches of oval shape worn by ladies on the breast.

Then they wrapped about Thor the bride's veil,
 And put on him the Brisings' great necklace.
 They let the hunch of keys rattle at his girdle,
 And a woman's coat fall about his knees.
 They fastened the broad-stones on his breast,
 And wound the hood deftly about his head.
 Then up spake Loke Laufey's son :—
 "I will go with thee as thine handmaid ;
 We two will drive to Giant-land !"
 Then the goats were driven home,¹
 Harnessed to the couplings. Off they ran !
 The rocks were rent, blazed earth in flame,
 As Woden's son drove to Giant-land !

Then spake Thrym, the king of the giants :—
 "Stand up, Ettins, and strew the benches,
 Now they are bringing me Freya to wife—
 Niaard's daughter of Noatown !
 There, walk here in the yard, good horned kine,
 Oxen all black for the joy of the giants' lord.
 Treasures a many I have, jewels many have I,
 I lack nought but Freya alone."

The hench was set for the women that evening,
 And ale borne round in the house to the Ettins.
 An ox whole, eight salmon,
 All the dainties cooked for the women,
 Sif's husband [Thor] ate, and drank three vats of mead.

Then spake Thrym, king of the giants :
 "Was ever bride so sharply set?
 Did ever bride take bigger mouthfuls?
 Did ever maid of mead drink deeper?"
 The hand-maid, all-wise one, sat by the couple,
 And found answer to the Ettin's speech.
 "Freya hath not eaten for eight nights,
 So eager was she for the land of the Ettins !"
 He bowed under the veil, he longed to kiss her,
 But he sprang back the whole hall's length—
 "Why are Freya's eyes so awful,
 It seems as if fire were flaming from her eyes?"
 The hand-maid, all-wise one, sat by the couple,
 She found an answer to the Ettins' speech.
 "Freya hath not slept for eight nights,
 So eager was she for the land of the Ettins !"

In came the Ettins' aged sister.
 She holdly hegged for a bridal fee.
 "Take the red rings off thine arms,
 If thou art minded to win my love—
 My love and my good-will withal !"
 Then spake Thrym, king of the giants :
 "Bring up the hammer to hallow the bride !
 Lay the Miller² on the maiden's knee !
 Hallow us twain together by wedlock's hand !"
 The Charioteer's heart laughed in his breast
 When he felt the hard hammer in his hands.
 First he slew Thrym, the king of the giants,
 And battered the whole breed of Ettins ;
 He slew the Ettins' aged sister ;
 She got a pound instead of pence,
 And hammer strokes instead of rings.
 This is how Woden's son won back his hammer.

¹ The goats are Thor's team, that draw his thunder-car.

² Miller, the name of the hammer.

There is a rough naïve humour in this ballad-like poem that reflects the tone of the primitive stages of society in which such legends sprung up. Thor was specially the god of the fisher-farmer and farmer-fishers of the west coast of Norway, whence came the bulk of the emigrants that peopled great part of Great Britain and Ireland, and the whole coasts of Iceland, the Faroes, and West Greenland.

All *natural phenomena* were ascribed to the agency of the gods or demons; storm and bad weather were wrought by spirits; frost and cold were the work of giants and much to be feared. Thunder was looked upon as a beneficent god—killing demons, bringing back the sunlight and fructifying rain. Pearls and amber were the tears of goddesses.¹ The peculiar shapes and colours of birds and beasts were accounted for by curious and ingenious stories, precisely as in the African Anansi-tales.

These beliefs were childish; but such explanations were the beginnings of science. They only differ from many of our hypotheses in their greater ambition and simplicity. We are content nowadays to try and make out the *how*, without seeking to explain the *why*.

As to *ritual*, animal and human sacrifices were offered. Instances are recorded of the sacrifice of kings for good seasons, and of launches of war-ships sanctified by human blood (as in New Zealand of old). Nevertheless, human sacrifices seem to have been always regarded with a kind of horror and awe. A great temple was at once treasury, storehouse, and meeting-place. Once or twice a year there were great sacrifices of cattle, persons were sprinkled with the blood, auguries were taken with hallowed apple-twigs, and afterwards the sacrificed beasts formed the material for feasts. They had village feasts, holiday feasts, Easter feasts welcoming the summer, midsummer and Christmas feasts.

The Teutons—differing in this from the Western Præ-Celtic peoples, and those Celts who had adopted their customs and beliefs—do not seem to have had a regular priesthood, though special persons were, by hereditary right, charged with the service of certain shrines. Some shrines were carried about at certain seasons through the land.

The greatest fanes we know of were situated at the headquarters of the great tribes or tribal leagues; thus at Upsala, the High-Hall in Sweden, the cult of Yngwe-Frey long flourished; at his grave-mound were a temple, a treasury, and a sacrificial place, and an oracle where folks sought, by various kinds of divination, to gain from the god a morsel of his prescience.

“Now we will speak a little of the superstition of the Swedes. That folk have a very noble temple, which is called *Uppsala*, placed not far from the city Sictona [Sigtan]. Near this temple is a very great tree, stretching wide its branches, ever-green summer and winter; of what kind it is no

¹ It is probable from a curious story in the *Kalevala*, that the nodules of white flint in the white chalk were looked on by the Fins as the clotted, hardened milk of some spiritual being, and that this belief was afterwards used to explain the origin of the later-known metals.

man knoweth. There also is a spring, where sacrifices of the heathen are wont to be made, and a live man drowned. . . . In this temple, which is all adorned with gold (for a golden chain goeth about the temple hanging over the top of the house, and shineth from afar upon those that come thither, for this same fane standeth in a plain, and hath hills standing about it after the manner of a theatre), the people worshippeth the likenesses of their gods, whereof the mightiest, Thor, hath his station in the midst of the hall, and Wodan and Fricco have places on either side, the significance of which is after this manner: 'Thor,' say they, 'ruleth in the air, and governeth thunder and lightning, wind and showers, clear weather and good crops. The second, Wodan (that is, Madness), wageth wars, and giveth man strength of heart against his enemy. The third is Fricco, that bestoweth peace and pleasure upon men, whose similitude they make with the emblem of generation. But Wodan they carve as an armed man, as we do Mars, but Thor is made to appear with the sceptre of Jove. They also worship gods made out of men, whom they endow with immortality by reason of their mighty deeds, as in the life of St. Anscar we read that they did with King Heric [a famous Swedish king deified after his death]. And all these gods have their special priests, who offer the sacrifices of the people. If plague or famine be at hand, offering is made to Thor; if war, to Wodan; if wedding is to be kept, to Fricco. Moreover, after nine years' span, a common feast of all the provinces of Sweden is held at Ubsola, from which feast none may be excused; kings and people, all and singular, send gifts to Ubsola, and what is crueller than all, they that have already put on Christendom must redeem themselves from those ceremonies. Now the sacrifice is on this wise. From all living beings, that are males, nine heads are offered, by whose blood it is the custom that the gods be propitiated; their bodies are hung in the grove which is next the temple. This same grove is so holy to the heathen that every tree in it is held divine, by reason of the death or blood of those offered. There also hounds and horses hang with men, whose bodies, hung together, a certain Christian told me that he had seen. For nine days common feasts and sacrifices of this kind are held; every day they offer one man, and one of each different kind of beast with him (so that in nine days seventy-two beasts are offered). This sacrifice takes place about the spring equinox. But the follies which are wont to be used in this rite of sacrifice are many and foul, so that it is better they be not told.'" So speaks Adam of Bremen (iv. 26-28) about the greatest of heathen Teutonic temples, a sacred spot for centuries, the Tara of Sweden.

In England the word Harrow marks a heathen "high place." There was always a temple at the place where the High Court of Parliament or Folk-moot of a tribe was held, and the court field was hallowed, and order kept there by the hereditary priests of the place (chaplains of these earliest Houses of Lords and Commons).

Heligoland, that tiny North Sea island, lately much in folk's minds, but

long famous only as a station for "bird-men," and a watering-place for north-west Germany, was once a famous fane and sanctuary. Adam of Bremen (iv. 3) speaks of it thus: "Now the archbishop [Adalbert] ordained from among his clerks, to Sleswick, Ratolf; to Seland, William; to Funen, Egilbert, who, they say, flying from pirates, first lit upon the island Farria, which lies out in the Ocean some way off from the mouth of the Elbe, and built a monastery there, and made it to be dwelt in. This island lies over against Hadeley. It is about three days' row from England, and it is near the land of the Frisians, or our Wirrahe, so that it can be seen lying on the sea. Its length stretches barely eight miles, its breadth four; men use straw and morsels of ships for fire. The story is, that if pirates take any prey thence, even the very least, they either perish by shipwreck or are slain by some one, for none can get home unpunished. Wherefore they are wont to offer to the hermits living there a tithe of their plunder with great devoutness. Moreover, this island is most fertile in crops, most rich in birds, and a foster-mother of flocks; it has only one hill, no tree; it is shut in by very rugged cliffs, with no entrance but one, where is also a spring of sweet water, a place to be honoured by all seamen, but especially by pirates, whereby it took its name, and was called Holy Land. In the life of St Willebrord we learn that it used to be called Foseti's land. In the life of St Liudger it is told that a certain man named Landricus was baptized there by the bishop in the days of Charles [the Great]." In the temples and holy places no weapon could be worn, no unhallowed act performed, under penalty of the god's high displeasure, as we learn from Bede's story of the converted heathen priest, Coifi (Coibhe),¹ who, mounted on a horse, and fully armed, rode into the sacred temple-enclosure, and hurled his spear, in defiance of the god to which the temple belonged, at Godmundingham, hard by York.

With regard to *death* and the *future life*, there were two pretty distinct sets of ideas. The older seems to have been, that at death man's spirit dwelt in the grave where his body lay. These barrows—*tumuli*—were the resting-places of the dead who inhabited them, just as the living inhabit houses. With the deceased were always buried those things which it was thought would be useful to him in his spirit life.

No one was supposed to die naturally; it was always some being, such as Weird or Fate, or the War-goddess, or the Fever-spirit, or some spirit sent by witchcraft, which destroyed a man; and then Death, a kind of psychopomp (like Hermeias in ancient Hellas, or Charon in modern Greece), led his spirit away.

Again, there was among the old English a belief that at death man took a long journey, and plunged into a great abyss, where dwelt a black goddess, from whom the name of Hell in other religious systems is obtained. If the departed were clever enough to elude the demons there, they passed on into a happier sphere. This is, in some of its later forms, a kind of

¹ A Briton (like Cadmon) by name, but a priest of Teutonic gods.

heathen reflex of the Christian idea, but in its earlier forms it resembles certain Polynesian beliefs.

Some of the Teutons seem (in the eighth century, at least) to have believed in the transmigration of souls, in a dead hero being born again in his descendant. Hence, when Hakon the Good—our Athelstane's foster-son—came back to Norway, men said: "It is Harold Fairhair come again!" And the soul of Helge the Good was—according to a fine tenth-century poem—twice re-incarnated in heroes named Helge.

As to punishment after death, as early as the eighth century, there was a widespread belief that the worst evildoers, such as perjurers, murderers, persons of foul life, and traitors, would meet a fit recompense in the next world; and Christians in England, Germany, Scandinavia, and France, throughout the Middle Ages, had their ideas of the last judgment and the next world deeply coloured by these old heathen beliefs. But, till the infiltration of Christian ideas, in the ninth century, they had not arrived at any idea of a great day of doom.

The elaborate Walhalla *pantheon* found in the later *Edda* was put together by Christian scholars, from different and diverging sources, after the heathen days; and the *eschatology*, with its Ragnarok, is largely drawn from one poem, the *Völuspá*, or Sybil's Prophecy, which bears evident traces of Christian influence.

One of the most important of their religious institutions, but one which we can only reconstruct by piecing together bits of scattered fact, was the *clan* or *totem* system, an institution very widespread and very important in the early history of many races, both of the Old and New Worlds. The pattern of nomenclature among the Teutons seems to point to the system being in full vigour down to pretty recent times. But it fell rapidly before the economic and social changes brought about by an altered mode of life, and by the change of thought consequent upon contact with Christianity. The members of a clan probably could not intermarry; they traced descent originally through the mother; they bore the name of their *totem*, or ancestor, as part of their own name; and, no doubt, they had certain common legal rights, and performed certain religious rites in common. The eagle, the wolf, the bear, the horse, the war-goddess, the chief god of the tribe under many epithets, the rock, the spear, the blade, the helm, the mail-coat, the home-land, the day, the sun, the shrine, are the chief *totems* used by the early Teutons. The Aethelings, who ruled South Britain in the ninth and tenth centuries, the Gothic Amalings and Balthings, the Choruscan Sigelings, are examples of famous royal clans.

Witchcraft, of a type resembling that of the Obi or Voodoo *black-magic* cult, was met with among the early Teutons, and was to them, even as heathens, a thing hateful and horrible, loathsome to gods and men; though seers, and weather-prophets, soothsayers and men of second sight, augurs and dream-readers, were revered and treated as specially favoured by the gods, who had given them part of their own divine knowledge; and

white magic was often appealed to to frustrate the wicked assaults of witches and wizards.

Turning from ritual and the creed of Teutonic heathendom to its *ethical system* an immense superiority is manifest. There were no "Ten Commandments," but good manners and morals were taught in songs, and given to the young in the form of story. One old poetic Dialogue between Father and Son contains many precepts—as, how to behave as a guest, as a friend, and as a householder, and much wisdom in the form of proverbs. The first virtue is bravery, the next is manliness. Uprightness of life, cleanness of living, were enforced. Sincerity and generosity were directed. Silence was a virtue. Reverence was much enjoined, and, indeed, no people can advance far without a high regard being paid to this virtue. Reverence was paid, not so much to the gods as to those things that were worthy of respect—to family life, the political organization, to the king, to the aged, to women and children. There was also a high ideal of duty to kindred, lord, and comrade, and among the free classes a high standard of self-respect. History and geography and statecraft were taught by the heroic lays, which recorded the deeds and deaths of great kings and champions of old. Thus songs about Attila were made in Greenland in the 11th century, 600 years after him.

Alongside of such excellent principles as the old poems teach and testify to, there were great shortcomings—harshness, deceit, and cruelty towards all who were not kinsfolk or friends (for only these were considered as within the ethical circle; all the rest of the world was outside with the animals); pride and self-complacency, false ideas of honour, weakness in face of superstitious fears, though we find noble examples in which, out of their own truth and sweetness of nature, men refused and scorned sins which those around them commended and committed.

With such good ethical principles, and such poor creed and ritual, it is not to be wondered that the heathen beliefs and faith went down before Christianity without any compulsion; and that, in England and Scandinavia at least, Christianity was accepted willingly and readily by king and people.

There were many gains accruing from the adoption of the new system. First, kindness was enforced as a duty towards slaves, paupers, and persons not of their own family. Next, there was greater truthfulness and stricter keeping of covenants, which rendered higher political progress possible. Third, the importance of self-sacrifice to duty was more decidedly enjoined. Fourth, the cruel terrors and foul superstitions connected with witchcraft were put away. Fifth, the greater simplicity and reasonableness of the New Faith opened the way to further advance in thought. Last, the New Faith brought its Teutonic votaries into touch with other European nations, with anterior civilizations, and with a certain amount of knowledge won from nature by wise men in the past.

After this brief and necessarily imperfect sketch of a great subject—

every paragraph in which might be illustrated by numerous examples and instances, and sustained by lengthy argument and copious exposition—it may be well to conclude by giving a faithful and plain version of a poem composed in the last days of Teutonic heathendom by a warrior and poet, named Egil, who had served our own King Athelstan, had wandered over many northern lands and seas, and settled down at last, after all his chequered career abroad, in his father's house in the new colony of Iceland, looking for peace. But he met with a series of misfortunes in his old age; and, worst of all, came the death of his two eldest and best-beloved sons. The first, Gunnere, had died of fever; the second was drowned. It is told that when the news of the last calamity came upon him that Egil rode to the shore to seek his son's body, and came right upon it, and took it up and set it across his knees, and rode with it to the grave of his own father. Then he had the grave opened, and laid his son therein by the side of his grandfather. And the grave was not closed again till about sunset. Then Egil rode straight home and went in and shut himself up in his own room and lay down. There he lay, speechless and neither eating nor drinking all that night and next day, and no one dared to speak to him or reason with him. But on the third morning his wife sent a man on horseback off to fetch Thorberg, his favourite daughter, who was living some way off with her husband. She at once started for her father's house, and rode all the evening and through the night without halting till she reached it. Then she alighted, and went into the hall. Her mother greeted her: "Have ye eaten by the way?" Says Thorberg: "I have taken neither bit nor sup, nor will I till I sup with Woden's wife [the goddess]; I will follow my father and brother." Then she went to her father's door and cried: "Come, father, for I wish us both to go the same way!" And Egil opened the door to her, saying: "Thou hast done well, daughter, to wish to die with thy father. Is it likely I could live after such sorrow?" But Thorberg did this that she might by some stratagem get her father to break his fast and live, and this she cunningly brought about, and then said: "Now our plan of starving is over, and perhaps it is better, for I should like us to live a little longer, father, that thou mightest make a dirge over thy son. For there is no one else that could do so fitly." And Egil said he would try to do as she wished. And as he made the dirge he grew better, and when it was finished he rose up and went forth, and recited it to his wife and daughter and kinsfolk, and then sat down in his seat and ate and drank and held the funeral feast over his son in heathen fashion. And he sent his daughter home again with costly gifts and much love. And this is the dirge, and it is called

THE SONS' WRECK.

It is hard for me to raise my tongue,
 the steel-yard of sound, within my mouth;
 Little hope have I of winning Wodin's spoil [poesy],
 nor is it lightly drawn from the hiding-places of my mind.

The heaviness of my woe is the cause thereof.

For my race hath come down to the stock
like the burnt trunk of the trees in the forest !
No hearty man is he that must bear in his arms
the corse of his kinsman from his house !

First I will with my song-blade [tongue]
hew this matter out in the hall of memories [my breast] :
Yea, this verse-timber, leafed with speech,
shall pass out of the word-fane [my mouth].

Cruel was the breach the billow made
in my father's fence of kinsmen !
I can see it standing unfilled and unclosed
the gap, left by my son, which the Sea caused me !

Ran [the ocean-giantess] hath handled me very roughly
I am utterly reft of my loving friends :
The Sea hath cut the bonds of my race,
its hard-spun strands that lay about me.

How shall I take up my cause with the sword
against the Brewer of all the Gods [the Sea God] ?
How shall I make war upon the awful Maids of the Storm [hill-women]
or fight a wager of battle with the wife of Eager [the Sea God] ?

Moreover I know that I am not strong enough
to cope with the slayer of my sons,
for manifest to the eyes of all the people
is the helplessness of me, an old man !

The Ocean hath spoiled me sorely :
it is a hard thing to tell over the slaughter of kinsfolk !

The second matter of my song shall be
how the Friend of the Gauts [Woden] raised up to Godhūm
the Sapling of my race [Gunnere], that sprung from me,
the tendril of the kin of my wife.

Yea, he is gone to be a guest at the city of the Hive [Paradise]

I know very well that in my son
was the making of a goodly gentleman :
if that fruitful branch had been left to ripen
ere the Lord of Hosts [Woden] laid hands on him.

He ever held fast to his father's word
though the whole congregation spake against it :
and upheld my cause at Wal-rock [the Moot-hill]
and was the greatest stay to my strength.

There cometh often longing into my mind
for the brotherhood of Arinborn [the best friend of his youth] ;
rest of my friends, when the battle is waxing high,
that bold baron, I think on him !

What other man that loves me well
will stand by my side against my foes' counsels ?

I often lack the strong pinions that upheld me.
I go with drooping flight for my friends are dropping away.
It is right hard to find a man to trust
among all the congregation beneath the gallows of Woden [the World-tree].

It is a proverb that no man can get
full recompense for his *own* son ;
nor can one born of another kin
stand to a man in the place of a brother.

I was friendly with the King of Spears [Woden]
and I put my trust in him believing in his plighted peace :
till he broke, the Lord of the Wain,
the Judge of Victory, his friendship with me :

Wherefore I do not worship the brother of Wile [Woden]
the Prince of the Gods, nor look yearningly upon him :
yet the Friend of Mim [Woden] hath bestowed upon me
recompense for my wrongs, if I am to count up his better deeds to me.

The war-wont Foe of the Wolf [Woden]
hath given me the blameless art :
yea, the poet's song, by which I may turn
open foes into well-wishers.

Now the Wreck of my Two Sons is sung to the end,
Night standeth near at hand :
but I gladly and with a good will
and without dread await Death !

This poem, badly preserved in a corrupt and incomplete text, necessarily loses in translation much of its character, its metrical harmony, its fine concise rhythm, its powerful flow ; but I do not think I could have chosen a more typical or nobler utterance of old Teutonic heathendom than these lines, instinct with deep grief and wrath, but all-inspired with a courage which never let the man sink to despair or mockery, but enabled him to beat out in the very furnace of affliction a poem which for beauty and strength is as wrought Damascus steel.

Human nature is everywhere much the same. Grief touches the same chords in us as it did in our heathen forefathers, and as it did long ago in those better-remembered heroes whose sorrow is enshrined in the Homeric Laments over Patroclus and Hector, or that Song of the Bow which David taught his people. Their primitive faith, clumsy and childish as it was, yet represented the higher instincts of their nature, their feeling for their fellows, and the awe that was upon them by reason of the unknown forces that compassed them about : our faith can do no more for us.

It is not in a man's creed, but in his deeds ; not in his knowledge, but in his wisdom ; not in his power, but in his sympathy, that there lies the essence of what is good and of what will last in human life.

[NOTE.—It is beside my purpose here to note the affinities of Teutonic Heathenism. The mythology is largely of the general Aryan type. There are many close parallels to the Celtic mythology in particular, and apparently also to Slavonic heathendom. This was of course to be expected. I do not believe that there are any traces of borrowings from the classic Latin or Greek mythology in extant old Teutonic myths ; though it is not impossible that older Oriental mythologies may have affected all these systems. It must be remembered that among the fairy tales of modern Teutonic nations are many which do not go back to the heathen days, but are drawn from *foreign* sources during or since the middle ages.]

MUHAMMADANISM.

BY G. W. LEITNER, LL.D., M.A., PH.D., D.O.L., ETC.

My special knowledge of Muhammadanism began in a mosque-school at Constantinople in 1854, where I learnt considerable portions of the Koran by heart. I have associated with Muhammadans of different sects in Turkey, India, and elsewhere, and have studied Arabic, the language in which their sacred literature is written. I may at once point out that without a knowledge of Arabic it is impossible to exercise any influence on the Muhammadan mind; but I would add that there is something better than mere knowledge, and that is sympathy: sympathy is the key to the meaning of knowledge—that which breathes life into what otherwise would be dead bones.

There are instances of eminent scholars who, for want of sympathy, have greatly misjudged Muhammadanism. Sir William Muir, *e.g.*, has been led into very serious mistakes in dealing with this religion.

Let us hope that the present occasion may help, in however humble a degree, to cement that "fellow-feeling" which ought to exist between all religions.

"In proportion as we love truth more and victory less," says Herbert Spencer, "we shall become anxious to know what it is which leads our opponents to think as they do."

More profound is the Tibetan Buddhist Lama's vow never to think, much less to say, that his own religion is better than that of others. The edicts of Asoka, carved on rocks, and more than monumental brass, also recommend his subjects to praise the faith of others.

As regards the great religion with which we are dealing to-day, I have adopted the term "Muhammadanism" in order to limit this address to the creed as now professed by Muhammadans. If I had used the better heading "Islām," which means the creed of "resignation to the Divine will," a more extensive treatment would have been necessary than can be afforded in the course of an hour.

Muhammadanism is not the religion of the Prophet Muhammad, because he only professed to preach the religion of his predecessors, the Jews and the Christians; both these faiths being in the faith of "Islām," of which the form preached by Muhammad is the perfection and seal.

"To walk with God," to have God with us in our daily life with the object of obtaining the "peace that passeth all understanding," "to sub-

mit to the Divine will"—this we too profess to seek ; but in Muhammadanism this profession is translated into practice, and is the corner-stone of the edifice of that faith.

In one sense Muhammadanism is like, and in another sense unlike, both Judaism and Christianity. To walk with God, to have God ever present in all our acts, is no doubt what the prophets of both these religions taught ; and in that sense they were all Muhammadans, or rather " Muslims "—namely, professors of the faith of " Islâm."

But so far as I know anything either of Judaism or of Christianity, the system preached by Muhammad was not merely imitative or eclectic ; it was also " inspired,"—if there be such a process as inspiration from the Source of all goodness. Indeed, I venture to state in all humility, that if self-sacrifice, honesty of purpose, unswerving belief in one's mission, a marvellous insight into existing wrong or error, and the perception and use of the best means for its removal, are among the outward and visible signs of inspiration, the mission of Muhammad was " inspired."

The Judaism known to Muhammad was chiefly the traditional " Masôra "—as distinguished from the " Markâba " ; indeed, pure Judaism as distinct from Buddhistic or Alexandrian importations into it.

The Christianity also which Muhammad desired to restore to its purity was the preaching of Christ, as distinguished on the one part from the mystic creed of St. Paul, and the outrageous errors of certain Christian sects known to the Arabs.

Muhammad thought the Jews would accept him as their Messiah, but the " exclusiveness " of the Jews prevented this. He, however, insisted on the Arabs and on " believers " generally participating in the blessings of their common ancestor, Abraham ; and his creed, therefore, became Judaism plus proselytism, and Christianity minus the teaching of St. Paul.

The idea of Muhammad not to limit the benefits of Abraham's religion to his own people, but to extend them to the world, has thus become the means of converting to a high form of culture and of civilization millions of the human race, who would either otherwise have remained sunk in barbarism, or would not have been raised to that brotherhood which " Islam " not only preaches but also practises.

The founder of Muhammadanism has been talked of by Christians in the most unworthy manner. Still, at first, he was regarded as a quasi-Christian Sectarian. Dante refers to Muhammad as a heretic in his " Inferno " ; and, indeed, in another sense, he was only a dissenter from one of the many forms which have adopted the appellation of " Christian." Some authors alleged that his religion was taken from the Talmud ; but it seems to me that the question of what Muhammadanism really is cannot be summed up better than in stating it to be pure Judaism plus proselytism, and original Christianity minus the teaching of St. Paul. This as regards its theory ; in practice it is far more than modern Christianity in its artificial European aspect—the " Sermon on the Mount " translated into daily life.

Every Muhammadan is a church in himself; every one is allowed to give an opinion on a religious matter, on the basis of the belief common to his co-religionists. They are not slaves to priests; they pray to God without an intermediary, and their place of worship is wherever they happen to be at the appointed hours of prayer.

Their preachers can also follow other vocations; some of them are shoemakers, etc. But, of course, the bulk of their ministers of religion are so by profession in regulated communities.

There is no such thing as a Pope among them.

Any ordinary Muhammadan may say, "By resigning myself to the Divine will I am myself the representative of the faith of which the Prophet Muhammad was the exponent." Indeed, the bulk of Muhammadans throughout the world are guided by the *consensus fidelium*. These are the Sunnis or Ahl Jemâ'a't, in contradistinction to the second most important sect, the Shiahs, which considers Muhammad and his lineal successors to be practically infallible. The Shiahs venerate the hereditary principle, and their religious profession is regulated by the interpretation of the Koran and of their traditions by their leading priests or learned men, the Mujtahids. (See Appendix III., on "The Mahdi and the Khalifa.")

Muhammad himself did not make any claim to infallibility. On one occasion he had a revelation censuring himself severely for having turned away from a beggar in order to speak to an illustrious man of the commonwealth, and he published this revelation, the very last thing which he would have done had he been an imposter, as ignorant Christians call the great Arab prophet. Allow me now to read to you the letter of an eminent religious Muhammadan functionary, the present Sheikh-ul-Islam of Constantinople, to a convert, Mr. Schumann, which I humbly venture to endorse, except the following passage: "On the day when you were converted to Islâm your sins were taken into account." This sentence cannot be taken literally; for, according to the Muhammadan faith, the sins of all are taken into account. There is a revered saying that the objection of one who is learned is "better than the consent of a thousand who are ignorant"; and, without in the least professing to be learned, I can, from a Muhammadan standpoint, claim the privilege of a believer in objecting to a ruling which has probably been rendered incorrectly in translation, and which contradicts the injunction addressed to *all* to "avoid sin and apply yourselves to righteousness," whether Jew, Christian, or Muhammadan. (See annexed letter of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, extracted from the *Diplomatic Flysheets* of the 16th October, 1888, on which Dr. Leitner's Lecture was, to some extent, a running commentary.)

With regard to the outward signs of a Muhammadan, such as prayer, alms, fasting, and pilgrimage, the religious books contain the necessary instructions. As for prayer, they practically enforce that "cleanliness is next to godliness," for ablutions precede prayer. The regulations regarding both acts are minute, and as to their ritual it is not of every Christian

that a priest could say what the Sheikh-ul-Islam says of every Muhammadan: "These things, however, may be learnt from the first Mussulman that you meet."

Their alms, which are rightly called only a pecuniary prayer, consist in giving up a portion, not less than a fortieth part, or $\frac{1}{40}$ per cent., of their goods to the poor. These alms go into the public treasury, and are applied, among other things, to the redemption of slaves, another subject regarding which Christians ignorantly accuse Muhammadans of a state of things which Muhammad did his best successfully to mitigate by a practical legislation towards its eventual abolition. (See Appendix II. at the end of this address.)

But, reverting to alms, in order that these be acceptable to God, the givers must show that they are in lawful possession of the gift (which, it is needless to add, can be increased beyond the legal minimum). It would not do "to rob a till in order to build a chapel," but those who voluntarily give more than the fortieth part will be rewarded by God.

The pilgrimage to Mecca is of great importance, as Muhammadans meet there from all parts of the world; it is a bond of union, and creates a real visible Muhammadan Church, such as the Christian world, with its innumerable subdivisions, does not yet possess for the assembly of an entire Christianity; it is, moreover, a great stimulus for the diffusion of culture by means of a common sacred language, the Arabic, in the same way as was the case in Europe when Latin was the one language spoken by all learned persons in addition to their native tongue. Thus by knowing Arabic one has a key not only to the Muhammadan religion, but also to the heart of the whole Muhammadan world. In Asia, and even Africa, in spite of the so-called semi-barbarism, any abstract Arabic word can become the common property of all the Arabic-speaking or Arabic-revering nations, and Muhammadanism thus possesses an agency of civilization and culture which is denied to other faiths.

Fasting is, of course, a mere discipline, but it is also of great hygienic value, and, as stated by the Sheikh-ul-Islam, "The fulfilment of the duties of purity and cleanliness, which are rational, also fulfil the hygienic requirements of the physician."

Indeed, as regards Muhammadan rules generally regarding abstention from wine, pork, improperly slaughtered flesh, the disposal of what would be injurious if not quickly made away with, etc., it may safely be asserted that they were not laid down to worry those who fulfil them, but to benefit them in body and mind.

With regard to social gradations, the rich man is considered to be the natural protector of the poor, and the poor man takes his place at the table of the rich. Nowhere in Muhammadan society is there any invidious distinction between rich and poor; and even a Muhammadan slave is not only a member of the household, but has also far greater chances of rising to a position in the Government or in Society than an English pauper.

Food is given to any one who needs it, and charity is administered direct, and not by the circuitous means of a Poor Law system. Indeed, from a Muhammadan, as also from the Buddhistic, point of view, the giving of charity puts the giver into a state of obligation to the receiver, since it enables the former to cultivate his sense of benevolence.

In the same way, among the Hindû Brahmins, when even a "sweeper" comes to ask for alms at a Brahmin's door, the latter worships him for having afforded him the opportunity for the exercise of charity. Such a view, in my humble opinion, includes all the "graces" of the truest and widest Christian charity, and, from that standpoint, I can only say that the best "Christians" I ever knew were a Brahmin who had never heard the name of Christ, an old Muhammadan who revered Him as a prophet, and a poor Jew who nursed through a long illness the Christian who had deprived him of his little all.

Servants, although they partake of meals after, fare exactly the same as their masters.

In a Mosque there is perfect equality among worshippers ; there are no pews ; the "Imâm" of the place or any other worshipper may lead the prayers, and nothing can be a more devotional sight than a crowd of Muslim worshippers going through their various genuflexions with perfect regularity and silence.

Englishmen object to formalism, but they often worship routine and the letter, rather than the spirit, of rules. Indeed, it may be said that English precision is at the root of a great deal of evil ; and if charity in its widest sense is the greatest of virtues, the formalities that accompany its collection and distribution in this country destroy its very grace.

We do not seem to recognise that laws are laid down for general guidance, and that the letter of such laws is not to be the lord but the servant of our interpretation of them. Above all, our abstract charity, our abstract religion, our hard-and-fast rules are in contrast to the personal, individual, concrete, dramatic, allegorical, and imaginative which characterize the Eastern faiths and forms that have been adapted by us. There would be no Nihilists and no Socialists in Europe were Western society constituted on the basis of Muhammadanism ; for in it a man is not taught to be dissatisfied, as is the great effort, aim, and result of our civilization.

I would now draw your attention to what the Sheikh-ul-Islam says regarding marriage. The marriage contract requires the attestation of two witnesses, and constitutes a religious act ; but it is not sacramental, as with Christians and Hindûs.

The husband is to enjoy his wife's company, but he cannot force her to accompany him to another country ; he is, however, in the latter case bound to continue to maintain her.

When a connubial quarrel takes place, arbitrators may be chosen, and divorce is allowed if the parties cannot remain together otherwise than in a state of enmity. You will admit that Muhammadan legislation on the

subject of marriage does not deserve the opprobrium that has been cast on it by Christian writers.

The statement that among Muhammadans there exists the power of unlimited marriage along with unlimited power of divorce is not true. Divorce is not such an easy matter, as you may have perceived from the letter of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, for it cannot be obtained without the judgment of arbitrators.

Besides, at marriage a certain dowry is named, which has to be paid to the wife in the event of divorce; and many women fix the amount in a sum far larger than the husband would ever be able to pay, in order to secure themselves against the danger of a divorce.

The Christian, or rather Hindu, view of marriage, that it is spiritual, is no doubt higher than the Muhammadan; but the practice of Christian countries generally shows less observance of the sacredness of the marriage tie than that of Muhammadans.

Among the Hindūs marriage, being spiritual, cannot be dissolved, and among the Roman Catholics it can only be dissolved with the greatest difficulty; but whether the sacramental or the contract view of marriage be taken, the union is, as a matter of fact, in the vast majority of cases, of a permanent nature in all countries and among all religions, though I grieve to have to admit that, having lived among Muhammadans from 1848, for nearly forty years, in spite of their "unlimited opportunity for divorce," I have known of more cases of divorce among Christians than among them. I have also no hesitation in affirming that in kindness to their family, to the learned or aged, to strangers, and to the brute creation, the bulk of Muhammadans are a pattern to so-called Christians.

A few words may be said regarding the much-abused subject of Muhammadan polygamy. Apart from the fact that polygamy tends to provide for the surplus female population in the few places where there is such surplus, and that polygamy is a check on prostitution and its attendant evils, as also a protection against illegitimacy of birth, it cannot be denied that the vast majority of Muhammadans have only one wife. This is largely due to the teaching of Muhammadanism.

Muhammad came into a state of society where to have a daughter was considered to be a misfortune, and where female children were sometimes buried alive. There was no limit to the number of women that a man could marry, and they were a part of the property divided among the heirs of a deceased person.

On the unlimited polygamy which produced this state of things Muhammad put a check; he directed that a man could only enter into the marriage contract with two, three, or four wives, if he could behave with equal justice and equal love to them all.

Unless he could do that he was only permitted to marry one wife. Now as, practically, no one can be, as a rule, equally fair and loving to two or more wives, the spirit of Muhammad's legislation is clearly in favour of monogamy.

He also raised woman from the condition of being a property to that of a proprietor, and he constituted her as the first "legal" sharer whose interests the Muhammadan law has to consult.

The allegation has been made against Muhammad that by his own example he justified profligacy.

Let this statement be examined. Fortunately, we are not dealing with a legendary individual, but with an historical person, whose almost every act and saying is recorded in the Hadfs or collections of traditions, which, next to the Koran, form a rule of Muhammadan conduct. These "Acts of the Apostles" are subjected to the most stringent rules of criticism as to their authenticity, and unless the story of an act or saying of the Prophet can be traced to one of his own companions, it is thrown out of the order of traditions, which form the subject of critical investigation as to their actual occurrence adopted by Muhammadan commentators. We have certainly far less authority of a secular character for the sayings and doings of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well, then, on what authorities, good, bad, or doubtful, do the allegations of Muhammad's profligacy rest? I have no hesitation in affirming that, following every such story to its source, it will be found to be entirely unsubstantiated, and that, on the contrary, to the very great credit of Muhammad, in spite of many temptations, he preserved the utmost chastity in a state of society which did not practise that virtue.

Living among heathen Arabs, he remained perfectly chaste till, at the age of twenty-five, he married a woman of forty (equivalent to one of fifty in Europe); and he married her because she was his benefactor and believed in his sacred mission. As he stated years after her death to a young and beautiful wife, who was "only jealous of the old and dead Khadija," in answer to her question, "Am I not so good as she?" "No, you are not so good; for she believed in me when no one else did, she was my first disciple, and she honoured and protected me when I was poor and forsaken."

During the whole period of his marriage with her, twenty years, he remained absolutely faithful to her.

It is true that, at the age of fifty-five, we find him taking wife after wife; but is it not fair to assume that in the case of a man who had shown such self-control till that age there may be reasons other than those assigned by Christian writers for his many marriages? What are these reasons?

I believe that the real cause of his many marriages at an old age was charity, and in order to protect the widows of his persecuted followers.

Persecution was great against his followers, "the believers in one God." At one time no one was allowed to give them food, and some of them were obliged to escape to Abyssinia in order to seek a refuge with the Christian king of that land. The king did not give them up to their persecutors. Some of them died in Abyssinia; and their widows, who would otherwise have perished, Muhammad took into his household. The idea

that the Prophet had any improper intention in so doing is without foundation; especially if we consider that he had given abundant proof during his youth of continence. The story of the marriage of the Prophet with Zainab, the divorced wife of his freedman and adopted son, Zeid, has also given rise to misconception. It may be premised that the heathen Arabs considered it wrong to marry the divorced wife of an adopted son, although they had no objection to marry the wives (excluding their own mother) of a deceased father, just as some people nowadays might not mind breaking the Decalogue who would on no account "whistle on a Sunday."

Muhammad excluded all this "nonsense" by saying that an adopted child was not a real child; and this being so, it could not be supposed to be within the prohibited degrees. To affirm this truth and not to justify a new marriage, the Prophet received a revelation, which has been misconstrued as a sanction to a wrongful act.

It really seems to me that if men cultivated something like true charity they would have a different view of other religions than they now hold, and that they would endeavour to learn about them from their original sources, instead of from the prejudiced second-hand reports of the opponents of these religions.

Celibacy is rare among Mussulmans, and there are very few, if any, marriageable women that are not married.

Adultery is punished equally both in man and woman. The culprit is flogged with a hundred stripes publicly.

With regard to concubine slaves, the Muhammadan law will not allow their offspring to be branded with infamy; and the child of a slave inherits with the children of her master. Among us an illegitimate child has little protection, and even our highest ideal of marriage falls far short of, e.g., the Hindū marriage in a good caste, in which the wife prays for the salvation of her husband, as without her prayers his salvation could not be accomplished.

The Muhammadans have no taverns, gaming-houses, or brothels, nor have they any idea of legalizing prostitution; and as regards their general conversation it is infinitely more decent, as a rule, than that of most Europeans. I have seen young Muhammadan fellows at school and college, and their conduct and talk are far better than is the case among English young men. (See my letter on "Islam and Muhammadan Schools," published in the *Daily Telegraph* of the 2nd February, 1888.)

Indeed, the talk of the latter is often such as would incur punishment in a Muhammadan land.

The married woman is in a better legal position than the married Englishwoman, and she can give evidence in attestation of a birth, marriage, or death, which is still denied to a woman in republican France.

As regards the assumed immutability of the Muhammadan religion, there is a liberty of interpretation of the Koran which enables "Islam" to

be adapted to every sect and country: *e.g.*, the law laid down for its interpretation that a conditional sentence has to take precedence of an absolute one, is one that secures every reasonable liberty of conscience: *e.g.*, "fight the infidels" is an absolute sentence; "fight the infidels if they attack you first" is a conditional sentence, and has therefore first to be taken into account in determining the much misunderstood question of the "holy war," or rather "Jihád," against infidels. Indeed, no such war is legitimate except in self-defence against those who persecute Muhammadans *because* they believe in one God and who turn them out from their homes; in other words, as in the case of the Muslim refugees to Abyssinia (see Appendix V., article on Jihád). As for religious toleration, there is much more of it in practice among Muhammadans than *has* been the case at any rate, in Christian countries; and had this not been the fact, the Armenian, Greek, and Jewish communities would not have preserved their autonomy, religion, and language under, say, Turkish rule—a rule, I may add from personal knowledge, which offers many lessons of forbearance and humanity to Christian legislation.

Muhammad included Jews and Christians among Muslims; or those who believe in God and the last day "shall have no fear upon them, neither shall they grieve."

In the chapter on "Pilgrimage" in the Koran, the object of a religious war is declared to be the protection of "mosques, synagogues, and churches," for in them alike "the name of God is frequently commemorated."

Is not this as tolerant a position as we have only reached after centuries (if, indeed, judging from the present foolish crusade against Muhammadanism, which we are confounding with slavery, we *have* reached such a position)?

I know many Muhammadans who have subscribed to churches; how many Christians subscribe to mosques? Yet in them "the name of God" is, indeed, commemorated.

As for Muhammadan persecutions of Christians, they do not compare with the massacres of Muhammadans by Christians. *Ab uno disce omnes.* When Omar, in order to avenge a former massacre of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, swore to put the defenders of the city to death he refrained from doing so after taking it; for, as he said, "I will rather incur the sin of breaking my oath than put to death a single creature of God."

I cannot conclude this address better than by insisting on the fact that the Jewish, Christian, and Muhammadan religions are sister-faiths, having a common origin; and by expressing a hope that the day will come when Christians will honour Christ more by also honouring Muhammad.

There is a common ground between Muhammadanism and Christianity, and he is a better Christian who reveres the truths enunciated by the Prophet Muhammad.

denote the wise men or seekers after divine wisdom of Islám. The Súffis themselves connect it with the Arabic root *saft*, *sáf*, which signifies what is pure. Others see in it a historical allusion to the *ahl-i-suffa*, or "people of the bench," that is, the religious mendicants who used to assemble, almost from the first establishment of the religion of Islám, on the benches or banks outside the mosques, in the hope of receiving alms from those who came to worship there. On the whole, the most probable derivation is from *sáf* (wool), according to which the Súffis received their name from the coarse woollen raiment worn by them as a symbol of their disregard of earthly pleasures and their renunciation of wealth and luxury.

If the etymology of Súffism is obscure, not less so is the history of its origin. Is it, as we are told by Jámí and other Súffí biographers, as well as by many Muhammadan writers, who, though not themselves Súffis, think and speak of the Súffí doctrine and its adherents with respect or admiration, nothing more nor less than the inner doctrine of Islám, the underlying mystery of the Qur'án, the pith and kernel of the faith taught by the Arabian Prophet? Or is it, as an examination of the Súffí doctrine itself might well lead us to suppose, a system widely separated alike in origin, purport, and tendency from the Muhammadan faith, wherewith accident alone has associated it, and from which it borrows nought save somewhat of its outward apparel? And if we adopt the latter hypothesis, whence came its inward essence? Is it a remnant of some forgotten doctrine of pre-Muhammadan Persia? Is it a descendant of that Neo-Platonism, which, deeply tinged from the first with Eastern thought, was carried back to Persia by the little band of philosophers whom the intolerance of Justinian had driven into exile and compelled to seek a refuge at the court of the Sásánian king? Or must we trace back its origin to Buddhist monks or Brahmin priests, and seek in India its home and birthplace? Or, on the other hand, must we see in the striking analogies which Súffism bears to each of these systems nothing more than the similar result of similar processes of thought pursued by similar minds?

I cannot pretend to offer you a definite solution of this question, which, to my mind, cannot receive a final answer until the literature of the system now under our consideration shall have been submitted to a much more careful and systematic study than it has yet received. Had I been called upon to give my opinion on the matter five years ago, I should have stated it as my belief that Súffism was essentially non-Muhammadan, if not anti-Muhammadan, in character, and that it was the revolt of the Aryan spirit against a Semitic religion imposed by force of arms on an Aryan people. Were I obliged to express a definite opinion now, I should have to confess that further study, and a year's sojourn amongst the Persians, during which I enjoyed many opportunities of holding prolonged converse with Súffis of every shade of thought, have compelled me, if not altogether to abandon this view, at least to consider it as only partially true. Signs of that quietism and mysticism which are the essence of the Súffí doctrine are tr

be found almost from the beginning of Islām in Arabia, Egypt, Morocco, and other non-Aryan portions of the Muḥammadan world. We cannot, therefore, regard Šūfism as a movement exclusively Aryan. How far it accords with the teaching of Islām is another question. Isolated passages occur in the *Kur'ān* which serve admirably as texts for Šūfī homilies, nay, which almost seem to countenance that pantheistic Unitarianism which is the essential characteristic of Šūfism. "Thou didst not slay them," saith God, addressing the Prophet on the subject of the victory gained over the heathen at Bedr, "but God slew them; neither didst thou shoot when thou didst shoot, but God shot."¹ On the face of it this means no more than that God fought for His elect, but the Šūfī sees in it a much deeper significance, a proof that in all things God alone is in reality the One True Agent, and that man is, as it were, nought but the mirror wherein His acts are displayed. Neither does this apply only to actions wrought by God's saints in His cause. "If a good thing befalleth them," runs another verse, "they say, 'This is from God'; and if an evil thing befalleth them, they say, 'This is from thee.' Say, 'All is from God.'"²

To say that God is omnipresent is to say no more than every theist, Muḥammadan, Christian, or otherwise, would assert. And this is perhaps all that is meant in the verse: "And to God belongeth the East and the West, and whithersoever ye turn, there is the Face of God."³ But we are carried a step further by such words as these: "Verily We created man, and We know what his soul whispereth to him, for We are nearer unto him than the jugular vein,"⁴ for here it is distinctly implied that God pervades and interpenetrates every atom of the universe. Yet other texts there are which seem to imply the impermanence, if not the absolute unreality, of this same universe, as, for example, the following: "All those who are thereon (*i.e.*, on the earth) pass away, and there endureth but the Face of thy Lord, the Glorious, the Bountiful."⁵ With such texts before him, we can at least see how one brought up in the faith of Islām, and endowed by nature with the mystic temperament, can find in the book he holds divine a sufficient ground for the pantheism, the idealism, and the quietism which are, perhaps, in reality rather the outcome of his own spiritual tendencies than the logical consequence of the teachings of the *Kur'ān*.

From what has been said, you will already have understood clearly that Šūfism is not a system which can be referred to any one man. We cannot say "So-and-so was the founder of the Šūfī doctrine"; nay, we cannot even say who were the first Šūfīs. A prophet arises crying in the wilderness of Arabia; a mighty spirit stirs throughout Western Asia; conflict, clamour, tumult and strife arise; ancient dynasties are overthrown; ancient landmarks are removed; ancient creeds crumble away. When, after a century and a half, this turmoil has somewhat subsided, and the

¹ *Kur'ān*, viii. 17. ² *Kur'ān*, iv. 80. ³ *Kur'ān*, ii. 109.

⁴ *Kur'ān*, i. 15. ⁵ *Kur'ān*, lv. 26, 27.

new order which from this strife of conflicting elements and disintegration of ancient systems has slowly shaped itself is more clearly visible, Šūfīsm is in existence. How it may have arisen, I have striven to show you. How it did arise, I do not pretend positively to assert. I am inclined to believe, however, that its practical part, its quietism, its renunciation of worldly objects, its passionate longing for closer commune with God, preceded, and, indeed, led to its theoretical part, its pantheism, its idealism, its scorn of outward forms, its universal tolerance. In other words, the Šūfī was a saint before he became a seer. This view is supported not only by the history of those to whom a later age has given the name of Šūfī, but by the history of mysticism in general. How readily devotion passes into contemplation, and contemplation into vision and ecstasy, is seen not only here, but amongst the German mystics of the fourteenth century, the saints of the Romish Church, and the quietists of France. In full accord with this are the three states or phases of religious life recognised by Muhammadan mystics.

First, there is the *Šarī'at*, or Law, the ordinances laid down by God through His prophets for the order of the world and the guidance of mankind. Whosoever walketh in the Law, faithfully fulfilling its commands, walketh towards God, though perhaps blindly. Next to this, and above it is the *Tarīkat*, or Way, the path of search after God, the followers of which seek a higher guerdon than the delights of Paradise, and observe a higher rule of life than mere outward conformity to the Law. This path, beset with perils and difficulties, leads those few who are faithful to the end unto the highest and most blessed state of all, called *Hakkikat*, the Truth. You may perhaps wish to be shown more clearly what is the difference between these three states. I will tell you how it was explained to one who asked this question of a Šūfī teacher. "Go," said he, "and strike in succession each of those three men you see sitting there." So the inquirer first approached that one of the three who was a follower of the Law, and struck him a blow on the cheek. The man looked up, and at once struck the inquirer a similar blow, for thus does the Law of Islām enjoin, "Life for life, and eye for eye, and nose for nose, and ear for ear, and tooth for tooth, and for wounds (equal) retaliation."¹ The inquirer next approached the follower of the Path, and struck him in like manner. This man looked up and flushed as though in anger, clenched his hand as though to strike, but suddenly seemed to recollect himself, and, by a conscious effort, to restrain himself from returning the blow or addressing any remonstrance to his assailant. Last of all, the inquirer went up to him who had attained to the Truth, and smote him as he had smitten the others. But this man did not appear even to be conscious of the blow, the insult, or the presence of his assailant. As he was, so he remained, seemingly absorbed in a blissful contemplation which rendered him insensible to all around him.

The Šūfī not only adopts a higher standpoint in his dealings towards his

¹ Kūr'ān, v. 49.

fellow-man, but also in his dealings with God. Fuzeyl 'Ayyáz, a Šúfī who lived in the second century of the Muhammadan era, said, "I worship God in love, because I cannot bear not to worship Him." Another Šúfī, being asked who amongst mankind was the meanest and basest, answered, "He who worships God from fear or hope." "How, then," they demanded, "do you worship Him?" "For love," he replied, "for His love makes me serve and obey Him." The following anecdote illustrates still more forcibly to what extent perfect acquiescence in God's will is enjoined.

A dervish once said in the presence of 'Abdu'l-Khálík Ghujdawání, "Were God to give me my choice between heaven and hell, I would choose hell; for heaven is the desire of the soul, while hell exists but for God's good pleasure." 'Abdu'l-Khálík rebuked him, saying, "What business has a servant to choose at all? Let us go whithersoever He bids us go, and be whatsoever He bids us be."

Before we go any further, or pass from the ethical to the metaphysical aspect of Šúfīsm, I wish to insist very strongly on the absolute resignation to God's will, the perfect contentment with whatever His will may ordain, the utter meekness towards all men, in a word, the extreme quietism inculcated by the Šúfī doctrine. Of this point I may perhaps be permitted to give you a few further illustrations.

Sa'dí relates that he once saw a dervish who had been wounded by a leopard, and whose wound no remedies could heal, sitting by the seashore and giving thanks to God. On being asked for what he was giving thanks, he replied, "For this, that, thanks be to God, I have fallen into misfortune rather than sin."

Ruveyrn defined true nobility thus: "Nobility," said he, "is this, that thou shouldst hold thy brother excused in whatever fault is committed by him, while never so dealing with him as to need to ask excuse."

Abū Sa'd ibn Abū'l-Khayr, whose conversation with Avicenna has been already alluded to, gave the following definition of Šúfīsm:—"Laying aside what thou hast in thy head (*i.e.* prejudices, fancies, and pre-conceived ideas), giving away what thou hast in thy hand, and not flinching from aught which may befall thee."

Now that we have seen something of the practical outcome or ethics of Šúfīsm, we may proceed to consider the doctrine which underlies it. Before doing so, we naturally inquire concerning the sources whence we may derive information about this doctrine. Broadly speaking, these sources are four in number, as follows:—

Firstly, the sayings and aphorisms of the early quietists and mystics of Islām handed down orally by their disciples and followers, and finally committed to writing by the biographers of a later generation.

Secondly, the systematic works of those philosophers, half Platonist, half Muhammadan, and wholly mystic, who first gave to Šúfīsm a definite and detailed metaphysical doctrine.

Thirdly, the didactic poems and lyric rhapsodies of the Šúfī poets.

Fourthly, the teachings of contemporary representatives of the system.

Let us consider each of these in somewhat fuller detail.

The early quietists of Islām were, for the most part, neither philosophers, poets, nor, to any great extent, propagandists. They sought God, they sought peace of soul, they renounced the world, and they valued fame as little as they valued wealth. Hence all that we know of them is, in most cases, confined to the brief aphorisms and scanty anecdotes recorded by writers of a later age which had come to regard them as saints. In their own time they were more often regarded as heretics, if not as downright unbelievers, and not a few of them suffered persecution and even martyrdom at the hands of the doctors of Islām. One of the most celebrated of these martyrs was Huseyn ibn Mansūr, called *Hallāj* ("the wool-carder"), who was crucified or hanged at Baghdad on March 15th, A.D. 923, after suffering grievous mutilations and tortures. He was put to death on a charge of blasphemy, because, in that state of mystic ecstasy which the Śūfis call "Union" or "Annihilation in God," he had cried out, "I am the Truth," that is, "I am God." Being rebuked for this and told to say not "I am the Truth," but "He is the Truth," he replied; "Yes, He is all, but you say He is lost. Huseyn is lost; the drop has disappeared; but the ocean remains as it was." Many strange details about his execution are related. Amongst these we are told that though he bore the blows and buffetings of the mob, and even the amputation of his hands and feet, with unflinching fortitude, he wept when Shiblī, his former friend and a professing Śūfī, threw a handful of mud at him. When asked the reason of this, he replied, "What the others do they do ignorantly, but Shiblī knows that he is doing wrong." Though condemned by his contemporaries, he is generally accounted a saint by later Śūfis.

Concerning the charge on which he was put to death, one of his biographers, the illustrious Sheykh Farīdu 'd-Dīn 'Attār, says, "I am astonished why any one who thinks it right that the cry of 'Verily I am God,' should issue from a tree (alluding to the story of Moses and the Burning Bush, as given in the *Qur'ān*, xxviii. 30), this tree being still extant, should not think it right that 'I am God' should proceed from Huseyn, Huseyn being no longer extant" (for he had already during life merged his separate individual existence in that of God). "He saw that he was both lover and beloved, he himself being selfless between." Hāfiz, writing a century and a half later, says,—

"Those who attain their desire are, like Mansūr, on the cross,
For if, in face of this longing, they look for cure, they fail."

On the whole it is, perhaps, less wonderful that such a fate overtook Mansūr than that it did not overtake others whose utterances were at least as likely to provoke the hostility of the orthodox. Indeed if Bāyazīd of Bistām, who lived a little while earlier than Mansūr, actually said some of those things which are generally attributed to him, we can only marvel at the immunity which he enjoyed from the vengeance of the Muhammadan

doctors. If Mansúr was deemed worthy of death for saying, "I am the Truth," how did Háyazíd, who cried out, "There is none other than God within my cloak," escape?

Although the general drift and tendency of Šúffism is already apparent in the deeds and words of these early mystics of Islám, it is scarcely probable that with them it had yet assumed the character of a definite philosophy of the universe. To give it this character was seemingly a task reserved for the philosophers of a later generation, whose minds, deeply imbued with Platonist idealism, found in the mystical utterances of their predecessors a material to which they gave form and fulness. Amongst these philosophers many different grades of thought are observable, from a comparatively orthodox Muhammadanism, tinged with Platonism, to a Platonism almost merged in Pantheism, and often characterized by strong theurgic tendencies.

Of these two extremes, types may be found in the erudite and indefatigable Al-Ghazzálí, whose services to orthodoxy were so signal as to earn for him the title of *Hujjatu 'l-Islám*, "the Argument of Islám," and in Sheykh Shihábu 'd-Dín Suhravardí, hardly less erudite, but far less fortunate, who, long suspected of heresy and witchcraft, received from the doctors of religion who condemned him no favour but this, that he was permitted to choose in what manner he would die. Strange as it may appear, he chose death by starvation, alleging as his reason for this choice that he was so habituated to abstinence that this death would only be the culminating point of a life devoted to ascetic practices. Between these two extremes—the philosopher canonized as a saint, and the philosopher killed as a heretic—every grade is to be found. The majority probably tasted both of the sweet and the bitter in different proportions.

Amongst these, few exercised a greater influence on the development of Šúffism than Sheykh Muhiyyu 'd-Dín ibnu 'l-'Arabí, a Moor born at Marcia, in Spain, in A.D. 1165. When nearly forty years of age, he visited the East for the first time, and there he travelled or sojourned for another forty years, now in Egypt, now in Arabia, now in Turkey, now in Mesopotamia, until at length he died at Damascus in A.D. 1240. His writings, which were both numerous and voluminous, are still widely read in the East, especially in Persia; and, indeed, no works of this class have enjoyed such general and long-continued popularity. The fourteenth-century Šúffí poets of Persia were especially influenced by his thought, in particular Fakhru 'd-Dín 'Irákí and Awhad of Kirmán, of whom the latter actually conversed with him. His most celebrated works are his mystical commentary on the *Kur'án* and his *Fuṣṣu 'l-Hikam*, in which latter he professed to expound the esoteric doctrine of Islám, as communicated to him in visions by the Prophet Muhammad.

We now pass to the Šúffí poets, and it is these who present us with Šúffism in its most typical as well as its purest and most attractive form. It is almost impossible to over-estimate the influence of Šúffism on Persian

poetry. How rich a literature this is, every one knows ; yet were we to eliminate every portion of it which bore the impress of ŞŪfī thought, very little, and that, as a rule, the least attractive part, would remain. Of the great Persian poets, Firdawsī is perhaps the only one who is almost never mystical ; and indeed in the great national epic which occupied the greater portion of his life mysticism would have been out of place. Many of Persia's greatest poets, such as Saná'ī, Sheykh Farīdu 'd-Dīn 'Attār, Mawlānā Jalālu 'd-Dīn Rūmī, and Jāmī, consecrated their verse almost entirely to the elucidation and elaboration of the ŞŪfī doctrines. Almost all the lyric poets, like Háfiz (who gained for himself the title of *Lisānu 'l-ghayb*, "The Tongue of the Unseen World"), are mystical, as are the greater number of the epic poets, though in less degree. Indeed the satirists and panegyrists are almost the only ones in whose verse no trace of the prevailing mysticism is to be found. It is necessary, however, to insist strongly on the fact that the ŞŪfīsm of the poets is in many cases rather sentimental than philosophical, while in some instances it is merely a fashion. We must carefully distinguish between ŞŪfīs who chose poetry as the vehicle of their teaching, like Saná'ī, Jalālu 'd-Dīn Rūmī, Farīdu 'd-Dīn 'Attār, Mahmūd Shabistārī, and, to a considerable extent, Jāmī, and poets who sought to adorn their verse with ŞŪfī ideas and metaphors, like many of the lyric poets. It has been often and earnestly discussed whether the odes of Háfiz are to be taken in a literal or a mystical sense. Orthodox Muhammadans, who, while recognising the incomparable beauty of his poetry and the profound truths which often underlie it, are scandalized by his continual allusions to wine and beauty, generally assert that all his poems are to be understood allegorically. To this end they have invented a cut-and-dried terminology, according to which *wine* means spiritual rapture, the *cup-bearer*, the spiritual guide, and so on. Nothing can be more absurdly unnatural than this system of interpretation, just as nothing can be more intolerably dull than the commentaries based thereon. We can easily see, however, in what manner it arose. Háfiz, whose contemporaries regarded him with such suspicion and disapproval that they would scarcely grant him a decent burial when he died, was canonized by posterity and dubbed "The Tongue of the Unseen World." The most rigorous Muslims now read and admire his poetry, which they regard as a mine of spiritual truth. To do this, they were compelled to find some means of explaining away many things which, in their literal sense, could not fail to scandalize a good Muhammadan. Hence this absurd system of exegesis, and hence these wearisome commentaries. On the other hand, it is going much too far to state (as some European scholars have done) that when Háfiz sings of wine. intoxication. beauti-

allegorical meaning by the application of false and unnatural canons of interpretation.

To make clearer what I have said, let me first give you an instance of the style of interpretation adopted by the orthodox commentator, and then explain how, in my opinion, the allegorical and the literal are blended, according as the mystic or the hedonist temperament of the poet predominates.

Here, first of all, is a translation of two couplets of Háfiz :—

"Quick, O cupbearer, for sorrow lies in ambush for us;
O minstrel, continue that air which you are playing!
Give me wine, for the harp bent down its head to my ear, and said,
'Enjoy yourself, and hearken to the counsel of this stooping old man.'"

Here is the "spiritual meaning" of the above lines according to one of the commentaries above alluded to :—

"O my kind spiritual preceptor, who art the cupbearer of the wine of love, agreeably to the sense of '*be speedy in prayer before death*,' advance me by thy kindness one step forward in the ascent towards spiritual verities, for by reason of our lusts and the devil grief and wretchedness are lying in hiding and ambush for us. O thou who givest joy to the heart with Divine knowledge, keep us in this lofty truth which thou bestowest! O cupbearer of the wine of unity, ever give us wine, for that spiritual elder, whose back is bent in traversing difficult paths, and who smooths the road for us, whispered into my ear, 'Pass thy life happily in the joy of love, grieving not for aught, and hearken to the words of divine love and wisdom from true spiritual teachers, not from vain pretenders.'"

Now let me give you an illustration of how, as I believe, the literal and mystical elements are combined in these odes, and how the poet, at once keenly alive to the beauties of nature, and strongly inclined towards mysticism, passes in his verse from one to the other. It is spring, when the usually barren, stony soil has clad itself, as though to celebrate the New Year's festival,¹ in unwonted verdure. The poet, seated in some fair garden, bright with the rose, the narcissus, the judas-tree, and a hundred other flowers, inhales with rapture the soft, sweet-scented air freshened by the recent rain and warmed by the strengthening sun. Moved by the beauty of the scene and the charm of the season, he feels the poetic spirit stir within him, and in a few vivid and harmonious verses gives expression to the emotions which these inspire. Suddenly the sweet notes of the nightingale fall on his ear, and, as he listens to its thrilling plaintive song, his poetic fancy pictures it as a lover eloquently pleading with the beloved. The beloved is that opening rose-bud, coyly peeping from behind its veil of leaves, which, heedless of the passionate entreaty of the nightingale, coquets with the passing breeze from the mountains.

¹ The Persian New Year (*Nawrúz*), still the great national festival, is, of course, of Zoroastrian, not Muhammadan origin. It corresponds with the vernal equinox, when the sun enters the sign of Aries, and marks the commencement of the old solar year.

The bird's song takes a new meaning to the poet's fancy; it is no longer only pleading entreaty; it is the cry of a faithful lover slighted and scorned in favour of a passing stranger by that loved one for a glimpse of whose face he has pined and yearned through the cheerless winter of separation. Then the poet's mind reverts to a time when he too loved like the nightingale, and when in the spring season he was wont to pace these same garden walks with his beloved by his side. His heart saddens as he contrasts his present solitude with that sweet companionship, and his poem bursts into passionate entreaty for the return of the lost love. Then from the absent friend the thoughts of the Şúfí bard inevitably turn to God—the "True Beloved"—from whom all that is beautiful borrows its beauty, as from Him all that exists has its being. Then the poem rises into a loftier and nobler strain; rose, zephyr, nightingale, and beloved alike, recognised as nought but mirrors reflecting each an infinitesimally small fraction of the Divine glory, seem to merge into the light of the One True Being; and, in adoring ecstasy, the poet cries:—

"Now we call Thee the wine and now the wine-cup;
Now we call Thee the bait and now the snare;
On the tablet of the universe is no letter save Thy name;
By which name, then, shall we invoke Thee?"¹

What I have just said applies specially to the lyric poets. The apologues and anecdotes contained in the *Masnaví* of Jalálu'd-Dín—that mine of mysticism—are professedly, and, as a rule, obviously allegorical, the greater portion of them being fully elucidated in the text. The *Gulshan-i-Rás* ("Rose Garden of Mystery") sets forth in a thousand couplets the inner doctrine of the Şúffis and the meaning of the allegories and similes employed by them in the clearest and most definite manner possible.

We have now to consider the actual living representatives of Şúffism. Amongst these are, of course, mystical poets, Şúfí, or half Şúfí philosophers, and pious quietists and recluses; in other words, members of the three classes I have already discussed. Concerning these I need add nothing to what has been said above. It remains only to speak of the relation which subsists between the various dervish orders and Şúffism. These dervish orders are, as you are probably aware, very numerous throughout the Muhammadan East. The best known are the *Mevlevís*, or "Dancing Dervishes," and the *Rúfí'ís*, or "Howling Dervishes." Besides these there are the *Kádírís*, the *Bektáshís*, the *Oweysís*, and a host of others. The regular members of many of these orders wear a special dress, and each order traces back its traditions, customs, and methods of devotion to some great saint or spiritual teacher. Though differing in these and other points of detail, recognising their own special leaders and instructors, and observing their own particular forms and degrees, these orders are, generally speaking, well disposed also towards one another.

¹ Jámí.

The dervish may, perhaps, be best defined in European terms as an amalgam of the friar and the freemason. He differs from the former in the greater laxity of his connection with the established religion (by which, indeed, he is often regarded with suspicion, if not with downright disapprobation), and from the latter in his more essentially religious character and lack of definite pass-words and degrees of initiation. This being his general character, how does he stand with regard to Şúffism? That he considers himself a Şúff, there is no doubt, for he traces back the traditions of his order to some great Şúff teacher of yore, makes continual use of the phraseology of the Şúffs, and generally wears that woollen raiment from which the Şúffs derived their name. Nevertheless there is a great difference between him and the masters he reveres. What they wore, they wore to show that they cared nothing for the world and its luxuries; what he wears, he wears to show that he is a Şúff. They were Şúffs because they cared naught for outward forms; he, in so far as he learns to care for that very dress which originally typified this disregard for forms, ceases to be a Şúff. Many perfect Şúffs are to be found amongst the dervishes; but too often the dervish dress is but a new kind of formalism, even when it be not (as it sometimes is) a cloak for idleness, antinomianism, and even libertinism.

Having now cleared the ground, and determined what true Şúffism is, and whence we must seek the elucidation of its doctrine, we may proceed to attack the great and final question, "What does it teach?" In discussing this, I do not propose to consider any of those hybrid combinations of Şúffism with orthodox Muhammadanism on the one hand and with Greek philosophy on the other, at the existence of which I have already hinted. I shall confine myself to a consideration of the main tenets of what I believe to be the purest and most essential Şúff doctrine, and I shall, as far as possible, substantiate the statements which I shall have to lay before you by quotations from the best Şúff writers and poets.

The first point which I wish to insist upon is that true Şúffism, though as a rule associated with an outward profession of Islám, regards all religions as more or less perfect or imperfect shadowings forth of the great central truth which it seeks fully to comprehend, and consequently recognises all of them as good in proportion to the measure of truth which they contain. "The ways unto God," says a Şúff aphorism, "are as the number of the breaths of the sons of man." We might therefore characterize Şúffism as latitudinarian and eclectic, were it not that it is free from the apathy or agnosticism often implied in the former term, and that it rather adapts all religions to itself than itself to all religions. "Except the Lord build the house, they that build it labour in vain." No faith, no religion, no system, could endure unless it had caught some ray of the Truth which is the life of all. An utter lie cannot live, for it is the child of Not-being or Unreality, and death and disintegration are its

heritage. From every religion, then, something may be learned by him who has eyes to perceive it. All have the same goal in view, all seek after the same Friend. To adopt something of the language of the Šūfīs, the Beloved is one, the lovers are many; one describes the arch of the eyebrows, one the dimpled chin, one the rosy cheek, one the dark tresses :—

“All this turmoil and strife in the world are from love of Him;
It hath now become known that the fountain-head of the strife is One.”

Farīdu 'd-Dīn 'Attār in his mystical poem called “The Language of the Birds,” tells how the mysterious *Simurgh* (which, in his allegory, typifies God) passed over the land of China, and let fall thereon one of its feathers. This single feather filled China with wonder and delight, and every one who saw it sought to preserve for himself in sketch or painting some semblance of its beauty. Therefore, saith a tradition attributed to the Prophet, “seek knowledge *even unto China*,” for there, as in every land, be it never so remote or uncouth, shall traces of that for which it seek be found.

Hāfiz, in a most beautiful poem, wherein he describes how he seeks and finds God everywhere, and amongst all creeds and conditions of men, thus addresses a Christian with whom he holds converse: “How long will ye miss the way to the Unity? How long will ye place the stigma of the Trinity on the One?” And this is the reply which he puts in the mouth of the Christian :—

“‘If thou art acquainted with the mystery of the Unity,
Seek not to denounce us as unbelievers.
On three mirrors did the Eternal Beauty
Cast rays from His refulgent countenance.
Silk becomes not three [different things]
If thou callest it *parniyān* and *harīr* and *purand*.’¹
Whilst we were thus talking, from another quarter
This refrain pealed forth from the [church-] bell,
‘He is One, and there is nought but Him,
There is no God save Him alone.’”

So in like manner sings ‘Umar Khayyām :—

“Idol-temple and *Ka’ba* are alike the house of worship;
The ringing of the [church-] bell is the hymn of worship;
Girdle and church, rosary and crucifix,
Are all in truth the tokens of worship.”

Even from Paganism we may learn new truth, for, says Mahmūd al-Shabistar, in his “Rose-garden of Mystery” :—

“If the Musulmán understood what the Idol [really] was,
He would know that there was true religion in idolatry.”

“Any object of adoration,” says Hāfiz, “is better than self-worship”¹ for at least it serves to lift the worshipper out of himself and lead him towards that One who is proclaimed and hymned by all, but described by none, because, should any learn to know Him as He is,—

¹ Three words all signifying *silk*.

"He taketh the tongue from the sharers of the secret,
Lest they should repeat the secret of the King."¹

Let us hear what 'Umar Khayyám has to say about idolatry :—

"The idol said to the idolater, 'O my servant,
Knowest thou for what reason thou hast become mine adorer?
On me hath shone in his beauty that ONE
Who looketh forth from thee, O my beholder !"

The first and most essential qualification of the seeker after God is *love*; without this he can do nothing, and all else will avail him naught. Jámí says :—

"Be thou the thrall of love ; make this thine object ;
For this one thing seemeth to wise men worthy.
Be thou love's thrall, that thou mayst win thy freedom,
Bear on thy breast its brand, that thou mayst blithe be.
Love's wine will warm thee and will steal thy senses ;
All else is soulless stupor and self-seeking.
Remembrances of love refresh the lover,
Whose voice when lauding love e'er waxeth loudest.
But that he drained a draught from this deep goblet
In the wide worlds not one would wot of Majnún.
Thousands of wise and wary men have wended
Through life, who, since for love they had no liking,
Have left nor name, nor note, nor sign, nor story,
Nor tale for future time, nor fame for fortune.
Sweet songsters 'midst the birds there are in plenty
Whose meed of praise men's mouths are mute to utter,
But, when love's lore is told by the love-learned,
Of moth and nightingale they most make mention.
Though in this world a hundred tasks thou tryest,
'Tis love alone which from thyself will loose thee.
Even from earthly love thy face avert not,
Since to the Real it may serve to raise thee.
Ere A, B, C are rightly apprehended,
How canst thou con the pages of thy Kúr'án ?
A sage (so heard I), unto whom a scholar
Came craving counsel on the course before him,
Said, 'If thy steps be strangers to love's pathways,
Depart, learn love, and then return before me !
For, shouldst thou fear to drink wine from Form's flagon,
Thou canst not drain the draught of the Ideal.
But yet beware ! Be not by Form belated ;
Strive rather with all speed the bridge to traverse.
If to the bourn thou fain wouldst bear thy baggage
Upon the bridge let not thy footsteps linger."²

The great practical aim, then, is to escape from self, and until this lesson is learnt no further advance can be made. Worship, love, devotion to any one or anything, are therefore good in so far as they conduce to self-renunciation and self-forgetfulness. Self is at once the primal source of suffering and of sin. That it is the source of suffering is a fact recognised by many who know not the true remedy. Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí says :—

"Thou takest on thyself the shame of *bang* and wine
In order that thou may'st escape for a moment from thyself."

That self is the immediate cause of every form of sin is an evident fact,

¹ Nizámi, *Sikandar-náma*.

² *Yisúf u Zuleykha*.

taught, more or less clearly, by all the purer forms of religion. What, then, is this self, and by what means and whither shall we flee therefrom? To answer this question, it is necessary to take a more general view than we have yet done of the Šūfī conception of God, of the universe, and of what is meant by evil.

To doubt the existence of God—by which term I mean an Infinite and All-pervading Intelligence independent of what we call “matter”—is a thing which never occurs to the Šūfī. He may, and generally does, entertain doubts as to the reality of the phenomenal universe; but to him God is not merely the *greatest* but the *only* Reality. In other words, he regards God as identical with Pure Being. Thus, from the philosophical point of view, Šūfīism is pantheistic. Now the term pantheism is used in two quite different senses, which must be very carefully distinguished. There is a materialistic pantheism, which dignifies with the name of God the mere sum and totality of the universe. There is also a spiritualistic pantheism, which sees in the universe nought but a dim reflection “as in a glass darkly” of the Infinite Attributes of that Invisible, Omnipotent, Omnipresent Spirit of whom alone reality and existence can be predicated. These two forms of pantheism differ as light from darkness. To the one, the real is the apparent, the phenomenal, the material: to the other, it is the unseen or spiritual alone which really exists, and this solid-seeming world is but—

“Such stuff
As dreams are made of.”

Šūfīism, then, is an idealistic pantheism. To the Šūfī everything speaks of God. “There is nothing that does not celebrate His praise.”¹ He is everywhere and in everything, “nearer unto us than the jugular vein,”² and hidden only because so evident. “Show me what God is not,” said a Šūfī to one who questioned him concerning the Divine Being, “and, I will show you what He is.” Mahmūd of Shabistar says:—

“To him whose soul is illuminated
All the universe is the Book of God Most High.”³

And Jāmī says:—

“Thou art Absolute Being: all else is naught but a phantasm,
For in Thy universe all things are one.
Thy world-captivating Beauty, to display its perfections,
Appears in thousands of mirrors, but it is one.
Although Thy beauty accompanies all the beautiful,
In truth the Unique and Incomparable Heart-enslaver is one.”

This last quotation illustrates another point. I have already hinted that Šūfīism has two aspects—a philosophical, and a mystical or devotional. From the former point of view, God is Pure Being; from the latter, He is Absolute Beauty, of which all earthly beauty, whether it be beauty of form, of thought, or of action, is but a dim reflection. Our finite minds cannot comprehend the Infinite: we can but speak in metaphor, according as one

¹ Kur’án, xvii. 46.

² Kur’án, l. 15.

³ Gulshan-i-Ráz.

or other aspect of that Infinite Being reveals itself to us. Having regard to the power of God, some call Him "King"; meditating on His loving-kindness, others call Him "Father"; overwhelmed by His beauty, the Šūfī, in common with other mystics, conceives of Him above all things as the Eternally Beautiful. Hence do the Šūfī hymns borrow the impassioned language of the lover, and hence do they invoke God for the most part as "the Friend," and "the Beloved." Yes, He is the All-Beautiful, and the whole universe is the mirror of His Beauty.

But was it always thus? Did the phenomenal ever stand as a glass reflecting the Real? No; "God was, and there was naught beside Him," says a tradition which is one of the corner-stones of the Šūfī doctrine. Ere time began, God was alone in unrevealed and solitary splendour, "I was a Hidden Treasure, and I desired to be known, so I created creation in order that I might be known." In these words, according to another tradition, did God reveal the object for which He caused the phenomenal world to take form and semblance of being. An extract from Jāmī's *Yūsuf ū Zuleykā* will best serve at once as a commentary on the above texts, and a specimen of the strange, and, at times, almost startling metaphors adopted by the Šūfīs.

"In solitude, where Being signless dwelt,
And all the universe still dormant lay
Concealed in selflessness, One Being was,
Exempt from 'I' or 'Thou'-ness, and apart
From all duality; Beauty Supreme,
Unmanifest, except unto Itself
By Its own light, yet fraught with power to charm
The souls of all; concealed in the Unseen,
An Essence pure, unstained by aught of ill.
No mirror to reflect Its loveliness,
Nor comb to touch Its locks; the morning breeze
Ne'er stirred Its tresses; no collyrium
Lent lustre to Its eyes; no rosy cheeks
O'ershadowed by dark curls like hyacinth
Nor peach-like down were there; no dusky mole
Adorned Its face; no eye had yet beheld
Its image. To Itself it sang of love
In wordless measures. By Itself it cast
The die of love. But Beauty cannot brook
Concealment and the veil, nor patient rest
Unseen and unadmired: 'twill burst all bonds,
And from Its prison-casement to the world
Reveal Itself. See where the tulip grows
In upland meadows, how in balmy spring
It decks itself; and how amidst its thorns
The wild rose rends its garment, and reveals
Its loveliness. Thou too, when some rare thought,
Or beauteous image, or deep mystery
Flashes across thy soul, canst not endure
To let it pass, but holdst it, that perchance
In speech or writing thou mayst send it forth
To charm the world. Wherever beauty dwells
Such is its nature, and its heritage
From Everlasting Beauty, which emerged
From realms of purity to shine upon
The worlds, and all the souls which dwell therein.

One gleam fell from It on the universe
And on the angels, and this single ray
Dazzled the angels, till their senses whirled
Like the revolving sky. In diverse forms
Each mirror showed it forth, and everywhere
Its praise was chanted in new harmonies.
The Cherubim, enraptured, sought for songs
Of praise. The spirits who explore the depths
Of boundless seas, wherein the heavens swim
Like some small boat, cried with one mighty voice,
'Praise to the Lord of all the universe!'

Each speck of matter did He constitute
A mirror, causing each one to reflect
The beauty of His visage. From the rose
Flashed forth His beauty, and the nightingale
Beholding it, loved madly. From that fire
The candle drew the lustre which beguiles
The moth to immolation. On the sun
His beauty shone, and straightway from the ~~wave~~
The lotus reared its head. Each shining lock
Of Leyl's hair attracted Majnūn's heart
Because some ray divine reflected shone
In her fair face. 'Twas He to Shīrīn's lips
Who lent that sweetness which had power to steal
The heart from Parvīz, and from Farhād life.
His Beauty everywhere doth show itself,
And through the forms of earthly beauties shines
Obscured as through a veil. He did reveal
His face through Joseph's coat, and so destroyed
Zuleykha's peace. Where'er thou seest a veil,
Beneath that veil He hides. Whatever heart
Doth yield to love, He charms it. In His love
The heart hath life. Longing for Him, the soul
Hath victory. That heart which seems to love
The fair ones of this world loves Him alone.
Beware! say not, 'He is All-Beautiful,
And we His lovers!' Thou art but the glass,
And He the face confronting it, which casts
Its image in the mirror. He alone
Is manifest, and Thou in truth art hid.
Pure love, like beauty, coming but from Him
Reveals itself in thee. If steadfastly
Thou canst regard, thou wilt at length perceive
He is the mirror also; He alike
The Treasure and the Casket. 'I' and 'Thou'
Have here no place, and are but phantasies
Vain and unreal. Silence! For this tale
Is endless, and no eloquence hath power
To speak of Him. 'Tis best for us to love
And suffer silently, being as nought."

The passage above cited contains as clear a statement of the Şūfī doctrine of creation as we could possibly wish for. In the beginning, ere time was, and ere plurality was, God, Absolute Being, Absolute Beauty, Pure Spirit (for all these terms signify the same essence), existed alone, quiescent and unmanifested. Why He should desire to manifest Himself is a mystery transcending human reason. Jāmī illustrates rather than explains this mystery by adducing instances of the universal desire of being revealed which is innate in the beautiful. If, for example, a beautiful

thought is conceived in the mind of man, it is not content to be hid, but seeks utterance, just as a beautiful face desires to be seen. This desire exists in all forms or manifestations of the Beautiful, because it is an essential attribute of that One, who is alike Perfect Being and Eternal Beauty. The keystone of all that follows is this inexplicable and fundamental axiom.

Granted, then, that manifestation is to take place, by what means can it be effected? A thing can only be known by being placed in juxtaposition with its antithesis. We could not, for instance, apprehend the nature of light were it not for the existence of darkness. To talk of the "existence of darkness" is, however, according to Şüffî thought, erroneous. Darkness cannot truly be said to exist at all; it is merely the negation of light, the Not-Light. According to this view, we restate and generalize the above proposition as follows:—"A thing can only be known by its negation." Here at once we find ourselves in possession of the solution offered by the Şüffî to the great Mystery of Evil. "God desireth to be known," says he; "things are known only through their opposites; God is good; therefore He can only be known by the appearance of evil. The Mystery of Evil is therefore identical with the Mystery of Creation."

Is the Şüffî, then, a dualist, a Manichean? Emphatically no. For since God is not only Absolute Good but also Absolute Being, so evil is essentially not only the Not-good but the Not-being. In other words, evil is an illusion necessitated by the conditions of manifestation; it is essentially the unreal, the false, the impermanent. The devil, then, if we wish so to personify evil, cannot be more fitly described than as the "Father of lies," or, in other words, supreme illusion and utter unreality. We cannot, moreover, speak of absolute Evil, since it is essentially transitory and conditional. Thus Jalâlû'd-Dîn Rûmî says:—

"There is, then, no Absolute Evil in the universe;
Evil is but relative; recognise this fact also."

We have now spoken of Absolute Being, which is absolute Good, or, in other words, God; and of Not-Being, which stands in antithesis thereto, and is, relatively speaking, evil, but, truly regarded, naught but a means necessary to the manifestation of Absolute Good. "What," we now ask, "is this Phenomenal, Material, or Contingent Universe wherein we move?" It is neither more nor less than the reflection of Being on Not-Being, a phantasm evoked by the Divine Idea from formless chaos, a commingling of the good with the evil for the making manifest of God. It is not substantially, then, *quâ* matter that the phenomenal universe can be said to exist, but ideally, *quâ* a manifestation of the Divine Mind. An illustration may serve to render this clearer. We see the reflection of the sun in a pool of water; this reflection reveals to us something of the true nature of the sun, and so far it is real. But it reveals to us only the attributes of the sun, and not its essence. In so far as it reflects the sun it is real, and all that it has of reality it borrows from the sun. On the other hand, it has no in-

dependent existence, is totally dependant on the sun for that semblance of existence which it wears, and disappears utterly when the sun withdraws its light; while the sun is perfectly independent of it, stands in no need of it, and can reproduce it again and again without withdrawing aught from itself. Such is the relation subsisting between the phenomenal world and God, and he who regards the former as endowed with independent existence is like one who should declare that the brightness of the sun's reflection in the water is inherent in itself and not borrowed from the sun above. In a word, the phenomenal world is the reflection of God in the mirror of Not-Being.

What, then, is the position and nature of man, the crown and consummation of Contingent Being? A passage from the *Gulshan-i-Rdz* will best answer the question :—

"Not-Being is the mirror of Absolute Being,
Whence is apparent the reflection of God's splendour.
When Not-Being became opposed to Being
A reflection thereof was at once produced.
That Unity was manifested through this Plurality;
One, when you enumerate it, becomes many.
Numeration, though it has one for its basis,
Hath, notwithstanding, never an end.
Since Not-Being was in its essence clear
Through it the hidden treasure became manifest.
Repeat the tradition, 'I was a Hidden Treasure.'
That thou may'st plainly behold the hidden mystery,
Not-Being is the Mirror; the universe is the reflection; and man
Is the Personality concealed in it, like the eye in the reflection.
Thou art the eye of the reflection, while He [God] is the light of the eye;
By means of that eye the Eye of God beholds itself.
The world is a man, and man is a world;
No clearer explanation than this is possible.
When thou lookest well to the root of the matter,
He is both the Seer, and the Eye, and the Vision."

O wonderful and mysterious Man! How true are the words wherewith thou art thus apostrophized :—

"Thy remedy is within thyself, yet thou seest it not;
Thy pain is in thyself, but thou knowest it not.

* * * * *
Thou thinkest that art but a small thing
Whereas in thee is involved the whole Universe!"

What, then, is the pain which man suffers, and how can he escape therefrom? For only by finding the cause of this pain can he hope to cure it; and to cure it, and thus gain peace, is the object of philosophy. That pain is love of self, the remedy for it is to renounce self, and the escape is unto God. So long as man is held captive by the illusion of self, he inevitably suffers from unsatisfied desire and unquenchable craving. Man may be compared to a mote floating in the sunlight; a mote luminous on its sunward aspect, dark on its earthward side. He is a compound of the Real and the Unreal, the Good and the Not-Good, the Light and the Darkness. If he looks downwards away from God, what does he see? A dark shadow of unreality cast by himself, which dark-shadow he takes for his

true self, and wherewith he forthwith unwisely clings. But this false self, this illusion, this phantasm, which he so eagerly cherishes, is in fact the source of all his pain, all his misery, all his wickedness. Let him learn the truth, and look upward to the One, not around on the many, and least of all downward at that dark shadow of unreality which he takes for himself. What does he then behold? The Light and nothing but the Light; the Good and nothing but the Good; God and nothing but God. This is the supreme happiness, the ultimate goal, the beatific vision; this, in a word, is "Annihilation in God." The drop is merged in the Ocean; the pilgrim has reached the Shrine; the lover is united to the Beloved. "Has he ceased to exist?" you ask. No, he is one with Being. "Has he lost the friends he loved on earth?" No, for what he loved in them was the reflection of that wherewith he is now at one. All that he ever was he is, and far more than that; all that he ever had he has, and infinitely more. But what he has, and what he is, tongue cannot say, nor ear hear:—

"These pretenders in His quest are devoid of knowledge,
For from him who has gained the knowledge no news returns."

Much more would I fain say did time and opportunity allow, but my allotted measure is fulfilled, though what has been here set forth—

"Is but one word out of a thousand which has obtained utterance."¹

I will therefore conclude with a translation of a beautiful passage from the *Masnawi* descriptive of the upward progress of the soul.

"I died from the mineral and became a plant;
I died from the plant and re-appeared in an animal;
I died from the animal and became a man;
Wherefore then should I fear? When did I grow less by dying?
Next time I shall die from the man
That I may grow the wings of the angels,
From the angel, too, must I seek advance;
'All things shall perish save His Face!'²
Once more shall I wing my way above the angels,
I shall become that which entereth not the imagination,
Then let me become naught, naught; for the harp-string
Crieth unto me 'Verily unto Him do we return!'"

¹ Háfiz.

² Qur'án, xxviii. 88.

BÁBÍISM.

By EDWARD G. BROWNE.

THE religious system which we are about to consider is deserving of an attentive examination for several reasons. It is no mere local superstition confined to a few families or tribes; neither is it a national religion, whereof the origin is lost in the mists of antiquity; nor yet is it a scheme of philosophy born in the sanctum of the student, and moving in a sphere of abstract thought far remote from the active world. Seventy years ago its founder was an infant only a few months old; fifty years ago his summons was yet unspoken and his doctrine yet unformed; forty years ago he terminated a prophet's life with a martyr's death, leaving behind him as his legacy to mankind a faith which now numbers its adherents not by hundreds but by thousands, which reckons its martyrs not by scores but by hundreds, and which, whatever its actual destiny may be, is of that stuff whereof world-religions are made. And to this rank does it lay claim, demanding nothing less than universal acceptance and undisputed sway, not only in Persia, where it was first preached and where it underwent that baptism of blood which was the terror and wonder even of those who proscribed and persecuted it, but throughout the whole world. A mighty claim indeed, but a claim which, if devotion even unto death and fervour which neither fire nor sword can quell go for aught, has at least established its right to be heard.

Before proceeding further in the examination of the history and doctrine of this new world-religion, it is necessary to glance briefly at the spiritual condition of the country which gave it birth. Persia, it is almost needless to state, is a Muhammadan country. Other religions are, indeed, represented: there are a good many native Christians, either Armenians or Syrians; there are a considerable number of Jews; and there are a remnant who still, after the lapse of twelve centuries, hold firm to the fallen faith of Zoroaster. Relatively to the sum-total of the population, however, these are a mere handful, and the nation as such is a Muhammadan nation. But the Muhammadanism of Persia is a very different thing from that which prevails elsewhere. The Roman Catholic differs less from the Protestant than does the Persian Shi'ite from the Turkish or Egyptian Sunni. It is neither necessary nor possible to consider here in detail all these differences; one feature only of Shi'ite belief—the doctrine of the Imámate—demands notice. To the Sunni, the caliph, or visible head of the Muhammadan Church, is nothing more than a defender of the faith, elected by the suffrage of the majority for the safe-guarding of the temporal and spiritual interests of

Islám. His appointment is human rather than divine, and his function is that of an administrator of the laws rather than that of a prophet or inspired teacher. Not so does the Shi'ite regard the Imáms, whom he recognises as the sole successors of the prophet. The Imám is divinely called to his lofty office; with his selection and appointment the choice of men has nothing to do; he is endowed with supernatural powers and virtues; his decision is in all things absolutely authoritative; and, in a word, he is an open channel of grace between God and mankind. Abú Bekr, 'Umar, and 'Othmán, the first three caliphs of the Sunnis, are in the eyes of the Shi'ites detestable usurpers, who snatched from 'Ali, the lawful Imám, a power to which they had no right and a position which they were not qualified to hold. They, and the Ommayad and 'Abbásid caliphs, who persecuted and slew the lawful Imáms of the family of 'Ali whom they had first despoiled and despised, are solemnly cursed by every true Shi'ite. The Imáms of the race of 'Ali are, on the other hand, loved, revered, almost adored; they are given a rank hardly inferior to that of the prophet himself, nay, hardly short of divinity; and the well-being of mankind is made dependent on their existence.

These Imáms were twelve in number. The eleventh, Hasan 'Askari, died in the year A.D. 874, and was succeeded by his son, who is generally known as the "Imám Mahdí," "the Proof," or "the Absent Imám." This Imám Mahdí was from the first involved in mystery, and communicated with his followers only indirectly through certain chosen and trusty representatives, who were called "Gates" or "Doors" (*Abwáb*, pl. of *Báb*). Of these "Gates" or "*Bábs*" there were four successively. When the last of them died, no one was appointed to succeed him, and then began that period of the "Greater Occultation," in which, as the Shi'ites believe, we now are. But the Imám Mahdí, though no longer accessible to his Church, did not die. He disappeared from the eyes of men in the year A.H. 329 (A.D. 940-941), but he still lives, hidden in the mysterious city of Jábalká, whence, in the fulness of time, when faith waxes weakest and the world is full of woe and oppression, he will issue forth to restore the true religion, fill the earth with justice, and inaugurate the millennium. For this long-expected day do all the Shi'ites wait and watch eagerly and anxiously, and ever when they mention the sacred name of the Imám they add thereto the prayer, "May God hasten his glad advent!"

It is in the year A.H. 1260 (A.D. 1844), exactly one thousand years after the Imám Mahdí's first retirement into seclusion, or "Lesser Occultation," that the history of the religion which we are about to consider properly begins. Before we proceed to speak of this, however, let us glance briefly at the meagre details which have reached us of the early life of its founder. Mirzá 'Alí Muhammad, afterwards known as the *Báb* or "Gate" (from which title his followers derive the name of *Bábí* which they bear), was born at Shíráz in Southern Persia on October 9th, A.D. 1820. His father, Mirzá Rízá, was by trade a cloth-seller; but, though in comparatively humble cir-

circumstances, he enjoyed that respect which is almost invariably accorded in Persia to a *seyyid*, or reputed descendant of the prophet. Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad was in the ordinary course of things sent to school, but he seems not to have remained there long. His removal thence may have been occasioned by the cruelty of his teacher, at whose hands he seems to have suffered much. He never forgot the unhappiness of his childhood, and when in later days he was framing the ordinances of his religion, he insisted most strenuously on the duty of treating children with the utmost tenderness and consideration, enacting heavy fines against such as should cruelly beat or ill-use them. "The object of these commands," he says, "is that men may not bring sorrow on that Spirit from the ocean of whose bounty they enjoy existence; for the teacher knoweth not Him who is his own and all men's teacher."

On his removal from school Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad was for a while engaged in helping his father Mírzá Rizá in his business. He was still but a boy, however, when his father died, and thenceforth he was taken under the care of his maternal uncle, Hájí Seyyid 'Alí. After a while, but at what precise date we cannot say, he left Shíráz and took up his abode at Bushire on the Persian Gulf, where he still carried on the trade for which he was destined. So far there was nothing specially noticeable in him save a gravity unusual at his years, a remarkable purity of life, a somewhat dreamy temperament, and a sweetness of manner which attracted all with whom he came in contact. At the age of twenty-two he married, and by this marriage he had one son named Ahmad, who died in infancy.

About this time, there dwelt and taught at Kerbelá, a spot most hallowed in the eyes of every Persian Shi'ite by reason of the martyrdom of Huseyn the third Imám which there took place, a certain Hájí Seyyid Kázim of Resht, the disciple and successor of Sheykh Ahmad of Ahsá, who had founded a new school or sect called after him *Sheykhís*. Of the Sheykhís' doctrine the most notable feature was the extreme veneration—remarkable even amongst the Shi'ites—in which they held the Imáms, and the eagerness wherewith they awaited the advent of the Twelfth Imám or Imám Mahdí. One day the circle of those who sat at the feet of Seyyid Kázim was augmented by a fresh arrival. The new comer, who took his seat modestly by the door in the lowest place, was none other than Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad, who, impelled by a pious desire to visit the Holy Shrines, had left his business at Bushire to come to Kerbelá. During the next few months the face of the young Shírází became familiar to all the disciples of Seyyid Kázim, and the teacher himself did not fail to notice and appreciate the earnest but modest demeanour of the youthful stranger. Then all of a sudden Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad departed as unexpectedly as he had come, and once more returned to Shíráz, his native city. Not long after this Seyyid Kázim died without nominating any successor. To some of his disciples whom he had seen weeping over his approaching death he had said, "Do you not then desire that I should go, so that the

Truth may become manifest?" How this Truth should be revealed was a matter whereat he had but darkly hinted, and so it was that his disciples, distressed and doubtful, met together after his death to fast and pray. Then they dispersed, each in his own way, to seek what they desired and await what they expected.

Amongst these disciples was one, Mullá Huseyn by name, of Bushraweiy in Khurásán, who had enjoyed a special intimacy with the departed teacher, and who had been regarded by many as likely to succeed him. On the dispersal of the Sheykhís to which I have just alluded, this Mullá Huseyn went to Shiráz, and on his arrival there he remembered that Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad, his former fellow-student, dwelt in this city. Anxious to renew his acquaintance with one whose amiable disposition had exercised over him a singular charm, he inquired after and soon discovered the house of his former friend. The door was opened by Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad in person, and when the first greetings were over the two fell to talking of Seyyid Kázim and his recent death. At first it was Mullá Huseyn who spoke, detailing the events of Seyyid Kázim's last days, and the hopes and fears which occupied the minds of his followers. But soon it was Mullá Huseyn's turn to listen in amazement to a declaration which Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad now for the first time made, to wit, that he himself was the promised guide and teacher, the "Truth" foretold by the departed Seyyid, the channel of a new outpouring of Divine Grace; in a word, the *Báb* or Gate whereby men might once again commune with the Imám from whom for a thousand years they had been separated. The amazement and incredulity which this declaration at first evoked in Mullá Huseyn's mind was soon changed by further conversation with Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad (or, to give him the title to which he had now laid claim, the *Báb*) into a belief whereof the sincerity was attested by every subsequent action of this first convert to the new faith.

In spite of the absence of many facilities of communication which we enjoy in Europe, news travels fast in the East; and no great while had elapsed since the "manifestation" (which took place on May 23rd, 1844) ere the *Báb* was surrounded by a considerable number of eager disciples. Amongst these were included many of the late Seyyid Kázim's followers, who, apprised by Mullá Huseyn of what had taken place, hastened with all speed to Shiráz. The zeal of the little band of believers was great. In the circles of their own assemblies they read with eagerness and rapture the *Commentary on the Súra of Joseph*, the *Ziyárat náma* or "Book of Visitation," and the few other works which the *Báb* had then composed; while from time to time each one of them was privileged to listen to the words of the Master himself as he depicted in vivid language the worldliness and immorality of the *mullás*, or Muhammadan clergy, and the injustice and rapacity of the civil authorities, or spoke with a conviction which compelled belief of the era of justice and happiness now at hand and the certain triumph of the new truth which he was commissioned to

proclaim. Already the Báb's fame was in every one's mouth and the Bábís were beginning to attract general attention (an attention which, in the case of the government authorities and the clergy, 'was largely mixed with suspicion and dislike), when the young prophet once more left Shíráz secretly, accompanied only by one intimate disciple, and set out to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca.

When the Báb returned from Mecca and again landed at Bushire, in August, 1845, the complexion of affairs was considerably altered. On the one hand, his ideas had doubtless become more clearly defined; on the other hand, the government and the clergy had decided that this new movement was altogether dangerous to them and must at once be checked as sharply as possible. Accordingly, when some of the Báb's disciples, who had preceded him to Shíráz, entered the city, they were seized by the governor Huseyn Khán, bastinadoed, and forbidden to preach. To ensure the effectiveness of this prohibition, one or two of them were hamstrung, so that they should be unable to quit their houses. Horsemen were also despatched to Bushire to arrest the Báb, who was brought in to Shíráz in the latter part of September, 1845. He was examined before the governor by some of the chief clergy, who declared him to be a heretic, and ordered that he should be punished with the bastinado and then confined in the house of 'Abdu'l-Hamíd Khán, the *dáríghá*, or chief constable. In spite of these measures, however, the new faith continued to spread rapidly, for many of the Báb's disciples were by this time scattered throughout all parts of Persia engaged in preaching his doctrine, while those who remained in Shíráz did not fail to find means of approaching him even in his confinement. The chief constable, indeed, seems to have submitted to the charm of his prisoner's gentle and amiable manner, and, according to one of the Bábí historians, he was actually brought to believe in the divine mission of the captive, to whose prayers he considered himself indebted for the recovery of his son from a mortal sickness. At all events, when, in the spring of 1846, Minúchihr Khán, the governor of Ispahán, anxious to see one of whom he had heard so much, sent messengers to Shíráz to discover whether he could by any means deliver the Báb from his captivity and bring him to Ispahán, the chief constable connived at, if he did not actually assist, the escape of his prisoner, who at once set out in company with two of his disciples for the latter city, where he arrived about May, 1846.

For nearly a year the Báb remained at Ispahán, and during this period he enjoyed the last days of comparative peace and security allotted to him. He was under the protection of one of the most powerful nobles of the time, who was both able and willing to protect him from the malice of his enemies, amongst whom the clergy were most malignant. But early in 1847 his protector died, and Gurgín Khán, who succeeded to the government of Ispahán, not sharing the feelings of his predecessor, at once sent the Báb off under an armed escort to Teherán, that the then-reigning King Muhammad Sháh and his ill-advised minister Hájí Mírzá Ákásí might deal

with the reformer as they pleased. The King would seem to have desired to see the Báb; but the minister, fearful lest his sovereign should yield to the potent influence of the young prophet, vigorously combated this proposal, pointing out the imprudence of allowing one whose doctrines had already made such progress amongst all classes to enter the capital and be seen by its inhabitants. The minister's advice finally prevailed, and orders were issued for the transference of the Báb to the remote frontier-fortress of Mákú, whereof the governor, 'Alí Khán, was a creature of the minister, wholly devoted to his interests. Thither accordingly was the Báb conveyed, but such was the sympathy of the people with him and their anxiety to behold him, that it was found necessary to avoid as much as possible all towns and large villages, and even amongst the escort appointed to guard him several conversions took place.

Soon after his arrival at Mákú, the Báb was summoned to Tabriz and again examined concerning his doctrine by a number of the chief clergy, presided over by the present Shah of Persia, then Crown-Prince. Concerning what passed there we have only the Muhammadan accounts; but even from these, partial and one-sided as they are, we can clearly perceive that, so far from there being any attempt at serious investigation, the proceedings were characterized throughout by the most shameful levity and unfairness. "If you are the 'Gate of Knowledge,'" they said to him, "you must of course be able to answer any questions we choose to ask you"; and thereupon they fell to interrogating him about the technicalities of medicine, grammar, philosophy, logic, and the like. To these senseless and insolent questions, the Báb, perceiving that he had been brought thither, not to be judged but to be mocked, returned no answer; and his persecutors, wearying of their sport, ordered him to be beaten and sent back to his prison at Mákú. Significant of the sympathy towards him which animated the common people, is the fact that the priests could find no one willing to execute their mandate, and were finally compelled to inflict the chastisement themselves.

So far from suffering himself to be discouraged by this harsh treatment, the Báb continued to write down and codify his doctrines and ordinances with unabated diligence. Two brothers, Seyyid Huseyn and Seyyid Hasan, of Yazd, shared his captivity. The former of these was continually occupied in transcribing and arranging his master's words; and, in spite of the strict injunctions of the Prime Minister, means were found to convey these precious writings into the hands of the faithful. The Báb's doctrines, too, underwent considerable development. He declared that he was not merely the "Gate" leading to the Imám Mahdí, but the Imám himself; that he was indeed the "Point," or Primal Truth once more revealed in man, and that what in previous revelations had been set forth darkly and in riddles he now proclaimed openly and without reserve. At the same time he claimed no finality for his revelation, declaring that after him one yet greater (whom he named "He whom God shall manifest")

should appear for the perfecting of that which he had begun. In the books composed by the Báb at this time it is curious to perceive that his chief anxiety was not for his own fate, but for the reception which should be accorded by his followers to "Him whom God shall manifest." Again and again, almost in every page, he entreats these not to behave in the next manifestation as the Muhammadans have behaved in this, and to remember that no revelation is final, but only represents the measure of truth which the state of human progress has rendered mankind capable of receiving. For about six months the Báb remained at Máku, and then the Government, perceiving that his disciples still succeeded in gaining access to him, transferred him to the closer imprisonment of Chihrík. Here it was only by means of letters concealed in walnuts, or sewn up in waterproof and sunk in milk, and the like, that correspondence between the Báb and his followers was any longer possible.

We must now leave the Báb for a while, and turn our attention to the efforts of his disciples to spread the new faith, and the tragic events wherein these efforts culminated. Mullá Huseyn, whom I have already mentioned as the first to believe, was conspicuous, even amongst the devoted missionaries who went forth into every quarter of Persia, for his fiery energy and indomitable spirit. Night and day, now in Ispahán, now in Káshán, now in Teherán, now in Mash-had, was he occupied in persuading inquirers, confirming waverers, and encouraging the faithful. Weariness and despair were alike unknown to the ardent spirit which animated that fragile-looking frame. Expelled from Teherán, he went to Mash-had; arrested there by Hamzé Mírzá, one of the uncles of the present Sháh, he nevertheless succeeded in effecting his escape, and, in company with a small but ever-increasing band of followers, again set out westwards, intending, as it would appear, to proceed to Máku and attempt to liberate the Báb. Now at length the enmity between the Muhammadans and the Bábís threatened to break out in open warfare, and at the village of Sháhrúd a serious collision seemed inevitable, when suddenly a messenger arrived announcing that Muhammad Sháh had breathed his last. This was in September, 1848.

When a king dies in Persia, a period of anarchy and lawlessness ensues, to which European countries are fortunately strangers. The local authorities, uncertain of the continued tenure of their offices, hasten to the capital to make favour with the new government, or else employ the days of disorder for their own ends. The mechanism of the State is for the time being unhinged and thrown out of gear, laws are practically suspended, plunder and rapine are rife, and life and property are imperilled. Such was the state of things which Mullá Huseyn was called upon to confront. It demanded all his judgment and all his energies; for if on the one hand there was a hope that the new government might prove more favourably disposed towards the Báb than its predecessor had been, there was on the other hand great immediate danger to be apprehended from the unre-

strained lawlessness of the ill-disposed, from which almost every check had for the present been removed. Mullá Huseyn accordingly pushed on rapidly to the village of Badasht, situated near the borders of the province of Mázarán, and there effected a junction with another band of his co-religionists under the leadership of Mullá Muhammad 'Alí of Bárfurúsh. Amongst these was one person so remarkable as to merit at least a passing notice.

Rarely indeed does it happen in a Muhammadan country that a woman attains distinction and fame. Yet if ever a woman deserved not fame only but immortality, that woman was *Zarrín-Táj*, the daughter of Hájí Mullá Muhanmad Sálíh of Kazvín, better known by the name of *Kurratu'l-'Ayn* ("Freshness" or "Delight of the Eyes"), which the Bábis bestowed on her. Endowed with rare beauty and yet rarer intellectual gifts, she was well versed in Arabic, the *Qur'án*, the traditions, and philosophy, besides which she was in her own language eloquent beyond measure, and a poetess of no mean order. Indescribably galling to such a woman must have been the condition of dependence and intellectual stagnation in which her sex are doomed by the ordinances of Islám to dwell; and it was probably on learning that the Báb sought amongst other social reforms to raise women to the rank of equality with men that she became first attracted towards his teaching. Once persuaded of its truth, she embraced the new doctrine with all the vehemence of an enthusiastic nature; and began, in spite of the violent opposition of her relatives (almost all of whom belonged to the clerical or priestly class), to profess and preach the Bábi faith. Compelled finally by circumstances which it would take too long to detail to fly from her native town of Kazvín, she now appears amongst the Bábis gathered in council at Badasht.

It was decided that to this beautiful, courageous, and eloquent woman should be committed the task of encouraging the faithful and confirming the lukewarm by an address delivered from a rude pulpit, hastily constructed of stones and logs heaped together. Every other sound was hushed and every ear was strained as that clear sweet voice began to speak of the new dispensation inaugurated upon earth, of the reign of universal justice and love which was at hand, of the approaching downfall of tyranny, bigotry, and oppression. As she proceeded, exhorting them not to stand back at this most critical moment, not to allow a craven fear to keep them aloof from the glorious enterprise, not to fail in the coming struggle for faith and freedom, the silence was broken by sobs of heartfelt emotion and cries of "*Ey Ján!*" ("O my life!"), "*Ey Táhira!*" ("O pure one!"), "*Qur'bānat garām!*" ("May I be thy sacrifice!"), and the like. The most listless and apathetic were roused; the wavering became assured, strong men wept. No hesitation or half-heartedness now; all were resolved to stand firm even to the death, and their later deeds bore abundant testimony to the unshakable firmness of their purpose. And now let Kurratu'l-'Ayn, having wrought her great work, depart for a while

to wander in the highlands of Núr, and to be betrayed into the hands of her ruthless foes. We shall meet her once again on that terrible day in 1852, when the storm of fire and steel and tortures not to be described or imagined broke impotent against a courage and steadfast endurance which has made the very name of Bábí a word which no Persian can utter without a certain involuntary awe and admiration.

It would take far more time than we have at our disposal to follow in detail the occurrences of those eventful days. Let us therefore pass on quickly to the ultimate fate of Mullá Huseyn and his companions. Eight months or so have elapsed since the events above recorded, and it is now the summer of 1849. You must try to picture to yourselves a flat fenny country covered with tall reeds and grasses or occasional swampy rice-fields, and sparingly traversed by narrow, muddy paths. To the north, dim and grey, lies the Caspian Sea. To the south, fen passes gradually into forest, which slopes upwards towards the vast black wall formed by the Elburz mountains. Just where the fens end and the forest begins, isolated amidst swamps and thickets, stands the tomb of Sheykh Tabarsí, a holy man of bygone days. The little building which marks the site of the tomb stands in the midst of a grassy sward about 100 yards long and 70 yards wide. This enclosure contains a few wild pomegranate trees, and is surrounded by rude earthworks and palisades. These, as well as the buildings of the shrine, are riddled with shot and stained with gore, while the grassy sward is marked with many a freshly-made grave. The forms of men emaciated to skeletons with drawn faces and sunken eyes (wherein nevertheless still glows the light of an enthusiasm which neither privation nor suffering can quench) pass occasionally across the enclosure. These are the remnant of the Bábís whom we last saw at Badasht hanging on the words of *Qurratu'l-'Ayn*, and this is their last retreat. Here for eight weary months have they held at bay the royal army, and, by dint of courage and skill incredible in men trained for the most part to peaceful avocations, again and again inflicted on it defeats and losses which had caused even the less sanguine amongst the besieged to hope for ultimate victory. But now at length the end has come. Their brave leader, Mullá Huseyn, is dead, killed in the very moment of an heroic exploit by a stray bullet fired from some hidden ambush. Their provisions are all used up. A few days previously a desperate but unsuccessful attempt had been made to cut through the ever-tightening cordon of troops. To give them strength for this final effort, they had been compelled to exhume the bones of the horse which had carried their gallant leader through his last fray, and from these to make a sort of broth which might at least serve to keep body and soul together. Absolute starvation now stares them in the face, and further resistance appears impossible. Yet, in spite of their miserable plight, so great is the dread with which their valour has inspired the royal troops, that even at this eleventh hour a message has come from the royalist officers promising them life and liberty if they will yield up their fortress.

To deliberate on this proposal the Bábí leaders are now assembled together in the inausoleum of the departed Sheykh. At length it is decided to accept the terms offered and evacuate the fortress. A written promise signed by the royalist leaders and confirmed by oaths sworn on the *Qur'án* lulls all suspicion of treachery; and now at length in slow procession the survivors of the Bábí garrison emerge from their stronghold, and pass through the wondering ranks of the besiegers to the place allotted to them.

At first all seems fair enough. Food is set before the starving Bábís, and their leaders are invited to take their breakfast with Prince Mahdí-Kulí Mirzá and 'Alíhás-Kulí Khán, of Láriján, the royalist generals. As the meal proceeds, the latter artfully turn the conversation on to religious topics. The unsuspecting Bábís speak freely and boldly of that which is nearest their hearts. The prince listens attentively, smiling now and then a false and cruel smile as he marks the success of his stratagem. Suddenly he springs to his feet, claps his hands, and cries out that his guests have uttered blasphemy, in that they make the Báb not only equal to but greater than Muhammad. Promises plighted to infidels are not binding, and shall not avert the vengeance of outraged orthodoxy. The soldiers rush in and seize the unarmed and helpless Bábí chiefs. Another party of soldiers fall suddenly upon the other Bábís, who, in the quarters assigned to them, have scarce as yet stretched out their hands to taste the first good food they have seen for many weeks. The captives are dragged before the royalist generals, and, at their command, cast down on the ground and cut open with knives. Five or six of the chief Bábís only are reserved from the massacre to grace the prince's triumphal entry into Bárfurúsh; and, bearing with them these and the heads of the slain set on spears, the victorious army sets out with beating drums and blowing trumpets for the town. On their way thither they are met by deputations of the *Mullás*, who congratulate them on their prowess and clamour loudly for the blood of the few remaining prisoners. The royalist generals had entertained the idea of carrying these with them to Teherán, that they might show to the young Sháh those who had dared for so long to withstand his armies. The *Mullás*, however, are importunate; the point is yielded; and Hájjí Mullá Muhammad 'Alí and his four or five surviving comrades are handed over to their inveterate foes, who tear them limb from limb in the market-place of Bárfurúsh. They meet death unflinchingly, as brave men should, and night settles down over the blood-stained and mangled remains of the last survivors of Sheykh Tabarsí.

The temporary lull which followed the suppression of the Mázandarán insurrection was soon broken by a similar struggle at Zanján in the north-west of Persia. Into the details of this struggle it is impossible to enter here. The scene is changed from fens and forests to the narrow, tortuous, mud-walled streets of a Persian town, lying, amidst pleasant poplar-gardens, which mark the course of a little river, in the stony, sun-baked table-land

of central Persia. But though the scene is changed, the incidents of the struggle are otherwise much the same. There is the same desperate and indomitable courage on the part of the Bábís; the same carelessness, cowardice, and mismanagement on the part of the besiegers. The Bábí women cut off their long hair to bind round the crazy guns which have begun to gape and crack under the constant firing, and are continually on the ramparts encouraging their husbands and brothers in the attempt to avert the inevitable doom. But soon, as at Sheykh Taharsí, the attack by storm is succeeded by the blockade, and the horrors of famine stare the besieged in the face. Then come the same treacherous promises, resulting in a surrender followed, as before, by a perfidious massacre of the too confiding Bábís.

This summer of 1850 was marked by other events not less fateful. While the siege of Zanján was still in progress, another Bábí rising took place at Níríz far away in the south of Persia. The Government, thoroughly alarmed, determined on a measure which, as it believed, could not fail to deal a death-blow to the Bábí movement. The Báb, who had now been subjected for more than three years to a rigorous imprisonment, could not, indeed, be considered as directly responsible for the attitude of armed resistance assumed by his followers; nevertheless the Government, regarding him as the fountain-head of those doctrines which had convulsed the whole Persian empire, determined that he should die. With his death, as they imagined, the whole movement must collapse. Had they been better acquainted with the Báb's doctrine, they might have hesitated before taking a step which could have no certain result save that of exasperating his followers beyond all measure. For, as a matter of fact, the Báb had striven to render his religion as far as possible independent of his personality in two ways. First of all, as we have already seen, he had declared that it was in no sense final, and had foretold the coming of "Him whom God shall manifest" to complete and perfect the religion which he had founded. Secondly, he had not centred the spiritual authority even during his lifetime in himself alone, but in what he called the "Unity"—a sort of hierarchy consisting of himself, "the Point," and eighteen other persons called "Letters of the Living." Why the number nineteen was chosen as the sacred number and employed as such, not only here, but in all the relations of life, it would take too long to explain. Suffice it to say that certain curious facts connected with the numerical values of the letters composing certain words indicating Divine attributes seemed to the Báb to point it out as a number essentially sacred, mysterious, and worthy of being made the basis whereon all things should be arranged. Now this "Unity" was in its very nature permanent; for, when any one of the "Letters" composing it died, the grace and virtue inherent in him passed to some other Bábí, who thereupon became incorporated in the "Unity," which in this way remained constant. After the "Point" (*i.e.* the Báb) the two chief "Letters" of the "Unity" had been Mullá

Huseyn and Mullá Muhammad 'Alí. Both of these having been killed at Sheykh Tabarsi, a youth named Mírzá Yahyá, and entitled by the Bábís "*Subh-i-Azal*" ("the Morning of Eternity"), now occupied the highest rank in the Unity after the Báb himself. Of this, however, as of all else appertaining to the Bábí doctrine, the Musulmán's were quite ignorant, and they confidently expected that the new faith would expire with its founder, on whose destruction they were now bent.

The Báb, therefore, was haled from Chihrík to Tabriz, and once more arraigned before judges whose sentence was a foregone conclusion. The trial which he now underwent was nothing but a protracted series of insults and indignities. One result, however, his tormentors were anxious to attain, and that was to induce the Báb formally to renounce the doctrine which he had taught. This, however, they were unable to accomplish. In reply to all their threats and promises, he continued to assert that in him was fulfilled what they understood by the coming of the Imám Mahdí. They scoffed at his pretensions, and told him that the Imám they expected was that same Imám who had disappeared more than twelve centuries ago in Surra-man-ra'a, and that when he came he would come as a mighty conqueror to slay and subdue the infidels, and establish the faith of Islám throughout the world. "Through just such vain superstitions," he replied, "did all former peoples reject and slay the prophets sent unto them. Did not the Jews profess to be expecting their promised Messiah when Jesus the Son of Mary appeared in their midst? And did not they reject and slay Him who was indeed their Messiah, because they falsely imagined that the Messiah must come as a great Conqueror and King to re-establish the faith of Moses, and give it currency throughout the world? Now the Muhammadans were acting as the Jews had acted, because, like them, they clung to their own vain superstitions, refusing to see that the kingdom and the victory spoken of were spiritual and not material."

The fatal sentence was pronounced by the civil and ratified by the religious authorities, and Mírzá 'Alí Muhammad was led back to prison. His last night on earth was not spent in solitude. With him were Aká Seyyid Huseyn, of Yazd, his amanuensis, and a young merchant of Tabriz, named Aká Muhammad 'Alí, who was his devoted disciple. The latter belonged to a good family, by whom every effort was made to induce him to save his life by renouncing his master. The following letter, written by him the very night before his martyrdom, contains his reply to a last appeal of this nature addressed to him by his elder brother:—

"My condition, thanks be to God, hath naught of ill, and 'to every trouble succeedeth rest' You wrote that this matter hath no end. What matter, then, hath any end? We, at least, have no discontent therein, and, indeed, cannot fitly express our thankfulness. The end of this matter is, to be slain in God's cause, and what happiness is this! The will of God will be accomplished on His servants, nor can any human being avert the Divine decree. What God wills comes to pass, and there is no

power and no strength save in God. O brother, the end of the world is death; 'every soul tasteth of death.' Should the appointed fate which God (mighty and glorious is He!) hath decreed overtake me, then God is the Guardian of my family, and thou art mine executor. Behave in whatever way is agreeable to God's good pleasure, and pardon whatever has been wrought by me which seemeth lacking in courtesy, or contrary to the demands of that respect due to you from your younger brother, and ask pardon for me from all my family, and commit me to God. God is my portion, and how good is He as a Guardian!"

Little by little the night ebbed away, and the sky grew bright with the dawn of July 9th, 1850. Ere the prisoners were led out, all Tabriz was astir, and when at length they were brought forth by their executioners, every street and lane through which they were to pass teemed with crowds of expectant onlookers. Of these, some were attracted by sympathy, or a hope that even now some opportunity for effecting a rescue might arise; others, drawn merely by curiosity to behold one so famous, were moved to pity by the pale gentle face, white delicate hands, and simple but spotless raiment of the sufferer; but the brutal rabble, urged on by the malignant and implacable clergy, cast stones and mud at the helpless captives, and gave vent to shouts of joy whenever a missile took effect. For several hours were the prisoners dragged thus through the endless streets and bazaars of Tabriz, until at length Seyyid Huseyn, his powers of endurance utterly exhausted, fell to the ground fainting with fatigue and pain. He was dragged to his feet and told that he might yet save his life and gain his freedom if he would renounce and repudiate his Master. And thereupon Seyyid Huseyn, whether impelled by a momentary fear which his exhausted strength could not combat (as asserted by the Muhammadans), or acting on instructions from the Báb, whereof the object was to preserve and convey to the faithful the last writings and injunctions of their prophet (as stated by the Bábís), did that which he was bidden to do, and as the price thereof received his freedom. No sooner had the crowd passed on than he gathered himself together, and at once set out for Teherán. On his arrival there he at once made his way to his co-religionists, who, whether convinced that he had acted under his master's orders, or moved by his sincere and evident contrition, received him back into their midst. That he was not unworthy of their confidence, he found the opportunity to prove when two years later the cup of martyrdom was for the second time presented to him.

Encouraged by the recantation of Seyyid Huseyn, the executioners made another attempt to induce Aká Muhammad 'Alí to follow his example. His wife and little children were brought before him in the hope that their tears and entreaties might conquer his resolution. Even against this most cruel trial he was proof, and only asked that he might be killed before his master. The soldiers, finding all efforts to move him fruitless, and being wearied to boot, led the two prisoners to the great square by the citadel

(called, by a strange coincidence, the "Square of the Lord of the age") and there suspended them with ropes from staples set in one of the walls. As the firing-party took up its position Áká Muhammad 'Alí was heard to say to the Báb, "Master, art thou content with me?" To this the Báb replied in Arabic, "Verily Muhammad 'Alí is with us in paradise!" Hardly had the words left his lips when the crash of musketry rang out, and for a moment the rolling cloud of smoke hid the bodies of the victims. As it lifted a great cry of wonder and awe rose from the spectators. The lifeless body of the disciple, indeed, riddled with bullets, swung to and fro in the air, but of the Báb no trace nor sign was visible. A murmur arose that this was a miracle, and the authorities perceived with terror that the fickle populace was ready to veer round and declare for one whom but an hour ago they had jeered and pelted. Had it been so, it might well have been that then and there the faith of the Báb would have won a definitive victory over the religion of Muhammad; and for an instant the fate of the Kájár dynasty and the faith of Islám hung trembling in the balance. But not so was it ordained. Ere the crowd had recovered from their first amaze, a soldier perceived the Báb (whose bonds by some strange chance had been cut by the bullets which passed harmlessly by his body) taking shelter in an adjacent guard-house, followed him thither, and made a cut at him with his sword. When the others saw the red blood flow from their unresisting victim, their fear was gone, and they hastened to complete their work of death. The two bodies were dragged through the streets and cast out of the gate to feed the dogs and jackals; but by night came Suleymán Khán, and one or two others, with gold in one hand and a sword in the other, offering the choice between these to the guards appointed to prevent the burial of the bodies. The guards took the gold and surrendered the bodies, which were wrapped in fine silk, placed in one coffin, and conveyed secretly to Teherán, to be there bestowed in a place of safety. So ended the short and sorrowful but noble career of Mirzá 'Alí Muhammad the Báb. When we reflect on all that he suffered during the six years of his mission, we can well believe that, as he says in the *Beyán*, "the days of his gladness were the days preceding his manifestation."

The tragedies of this fatal year were not yet ended. On the very day of the Báb's martyrdom the Níriz insurrection, and a few weeks later the Zanján siege, were quenched in streams of blood. Between these two events took place at Teherán the martyrdom of seven Bábis, accused without shadow of proof of harbouring designs against the Prime Minister, Mirzá Táki Khán. Amongst all classes, as we learn from the diary of an English lady¹ whose husband at that time occupied a responsible position in the British Embassy, their faith aroused general commiseration, and amongst their fellow-believers they received the title of the "Seven Martyrs."

¹ Lady Shell.

Amongst them was the Báb's uncle, Hájí Seyyid 'Alí, to whose care the Báb had been committed on the death of his father. It is worth remarking that in this case the prophet was not without honour in his own country, for amongst his immediate relatives the Báb found some of his staunchest supporters, and even at the present day many of the most influential and devoted Bábís belong to his family. At the last moment, almost as he knelt beneath the knife of the headsman, Hájí Seyyid 'Alí received an offer of pardon if he would consent to renounce his faith. This offer he unhesitatingly rejected, concluding his words with this quotation :—

"O Zephyr, say from me to Ishmael¹ destined for sacrifice,
'It is not a condition of love to return alive from the street of the Friend.'

Every one of the seven met death with like firmness. Amongst them was an old dervish, named Kurbán 'Alí, who also refused to save his life by recantation. The first blow struck at him by the headsman only wounded his neck slightly and cast his turban to the ground, whereupon he cried out as he stood awaiting the second :—

"O happy that intoxicated lover, who at the feet of the Friend
Knows not whether it be head or turban which he casts !"

A year elapsed after this, unmarked by any very noteworthy event, so far as the Bábís are concerned. Persecution went on steadily in all parts of the country ; but the general attention was somewhat diverted from the Bábís by the sudden disgrace and fall of Mírzá Takí Khán, the minister by whose advice the Báb had been put to death. From disgrace to death is for a fallen minister but a short step in Eastern lands, and even the fact that he was married to the Sháh's sister, who continually watched over his safety with loving anxiety, could not save the once powerful noble. He was enticed by a cruel stratagem out of his wife's sight, she being informed that the Sháh had once more taken him into favour ; and even while she was rejoicing in his imagined safety his life-blood was flowing slowly from his open veins. That no drop of bitterness might be lacking from the cup, the executioner, whose specious promises had for a moment lulled to rest the unwearying watchfulness of the minister's wife, was one who had been raised to the Sháh's favour solely by him whose fainting soul now realized the meed of those who put their trust in princes, and slay the holy ones of God. So perished Mírzá Takí Khán in the month of January, 1852 ; and we can scarcely wonder that the Bábís see in the fate which overtook him a signal instance of Divine vengeance.

Six months more elapsed, and then, in August, 1852, an event happened which brought down upon the Bábís a persecution fiercer than any which they had yet experienced. A certain youth named Šádík, of Zanján, whose

¹ It was Ishmael, not Isaac, whom, according to the Muhammadans, Abraham intended to offer in sacrifice.

attachment to the Báb had amounted almost to a passion, conceived in his mind a plan of taking vengeance on the tyrant who had slain his beloved master and ruthlessly persecuted all who held the Bábí faith. This plan he communicated to two of his fellow-believers, and, early on the morning of August 15th, the three, armed with pistols charged with shot, stood at the gate of the Sháh's palace of Niyávarán, awaiting the moment when the king, surrounded by his nobles, should go forth to the chase. That moment came at length, and, in the guise of suppliants, the avengers approached. Two successive pistol shots rang out on the air, and then, drawing their knives, the three Bábis rushed on the Sháh and tried to drag him from his horse. Ere they could effect their object the royal attendants were upon them. Sádik was stricken dead to the ground, and his two companions were seized and bound. The Sháh, slightly wounded in the back, had no sooner recovered from his alarm than he was filled with terrible wrath. The two surviving Bábis were put to the torture; but, though they avowed their faith and their object, they refused to disclose the names of any of their co-religionists, or to divulge their places of meeting. Their stubborn reticence was, however, unavailing, for a vigorous search, instituted by the secret police of Teherán, resulted in the capture of some forty Bábis, of whom a large number were surprised in the house of Suleymán Khán, the recoverer of the Báb's body. Five or six of these, including Behá'u'lláh, who now claims the allegiance of the great majority of the Bábis, were spared, but all the rest were doomed to die. Yet such was the fear in which the new Prime Minister stood of incurring the vengeance of the sect, that he resolved to make all classes partners in the slaughter of the prisoners. To this end he distributed these amongst the different departments of the Government, guilds of tradesmen, and other sections of the community, at the same time hinting to each that the Sháh would be able to judge of their loyalty and orthodoxy by the manner in which they dealt with their victims. The war-office, the secretaries of State, the merchants, the clergy, the dervishes, the pages in waiting, even the students of the University—then recently founded on a European model—each received their allotted prisoner. Terrible were the modes of inflicting death which some of these, impelled either by savage fanaticism, fear of suspicion, or mere love of cruelty, devised. Of the unfortunate Bábis, some were hewn in pieces, some were sawn asunder, some were flayed with whips, some were blown from the mouths of mortars. Suleymán Khán was marked out by his rank, and by the shelter which his house had afforded to the proscribed sect, for tortures yet more horrible. Lighted wicks were inserted in gashes inflicted on his limbs and body, and his teeth were wrenched from his mouth and driven into the crown of his head. Yet even in his anguish he continued to testify such rapturous joy at the thought of his pre-eminence in suffering and martyrdom, that his executioners asked him in bitter mockery why he did not sing. "Sing!" he cried, "and so I will." And thereupon he began to sing,—

"In one hand the wine-cup, in the other the locks of the Friend,
Such a dance in the midst of the market-place is my desire."¹

Amongst the victims of that terrible day were two with whom we have already become acquainted. One was Seyyid Huseyn of Yezd, who, consumed with the anguish of that day when, in appearance at least, he had renounced his master, met death not only with resignation, but with uncontrollable eagerness. The other was the beautiful and gifted Kurratu'l-Ayn, who, though for more than a year she had been in close confinement, and could not, therefore, have had any part or lot in the conspiracy against the Sháh, was too notable an adherent of the new faith to look for immunity. Dr. Polak, an Austrian physician then in the Sháh's service, actually witnessed her execution, concerning which he writes :² "The beautiful woman endured the lingering death with superhuman fortitude." Certain lines in some of the poems attributed to her authorship, and still passionately cherished by the Bábis, would tempt us to believe that she had long foreseen the inevitable doom which awaited her. The following translation of one of the most celebrated of these poems (of which I received a copy from a Bábi at Yezd in the summer of 1888) will suffice as an illustration. In it I have attempted to preserve the original metre and rhyme, and also to adhere strictly to the sense. Let it be borne in mind that by "the Loveliest One," "the Darling," and other such terms, the Bábi is throughout intended, just as the Súfis in their poems address God as the "Friend," and the "Beloved."

"The thralls of yearning love constrain in the bonds of pain and calamity
These broken-hearted lovers of thine to yield their lives in their zeal for thee.
Though with sword in hand my Darling stand with intent to slay, though I sinless
be,
If it pleases him, this tyrant's whim, I am well content with his tyranny.
As in sleep I lay at the break of day that cruel Charmer came to me,
And in the grace of his form and face the dawn of the morn I seemed to see.
The musk of Cathay might perfume gain from the scent those fragrant tresses rain,
While his eyes demolish a faith in vain attacked by the pagans of Tartary.
With you, who condemn both love and wine for the hermit's cell and the zealot's
shrine,
What can I do? For our faith divine you hold as a thing of infamy.
The tangled curls of thy darling's hair, and thy saddle and steed are thine only
care,
In thy heart the Infinite hath no share, nor the thought of the poor man's poverty.
Sikandar's pomp and display be thine, the *Kalandar's*³ habit and way be mine;
That, if it please thee, I resign, while this, though bad, is enough for me.
The country of 'I' and 'We' forsake; thy home in Annihilation make,
Since fearing not this step to take thou shalt gain the highest Felicity."⁴

Thus far I have traced the progress of the Bábi movement in a fairly continuous manner, although the need of confining myself within certain limits has compelled me to omit much of which I would fain have spoken.

¹ This couplet is from a well-known ode in the *Diván* of Shams-i-Tabriz.

² Polak's *Persien: das Land und seine Bewohner* (Leipzig, 1865), vol. i. p. 353.

³ A *Kalandar* is a kind of dervish or religious mendicant.

⁴ This translation I first published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1889.

We have now reached a point where the scene and the characters are in great measure changed; and indeed it would hardly be too much to say that we have now entered on a new epoch in the history of the faith. That I should strive to make clear the beginnings of that faith was essential, but space does not permit me to do more than sketch in outline its more recent developments. My desire at present is rather to awaken your interest and sympathy in an heroic struggle, which I do not hesitate to call the greatest religious movement of the century, than to communicate to you the latest results of research.

The centre of the movement, then, is transferred from Persian to Turkish territory; to be more precise, Baghdad becomes for the next eleven years the abode of such of the Bábí leaders as escaped the terrible devastation of 1852. Thither fled Mírzá Yahyá "*Subh-i-Ezel*," who, as I have already mentioned, became, on the death of the Báb, the chief "Letter" of the "Unity." He was soon followed by his half-brother, Behá'u'lláh (also a member of the Unity), who, having narrowly escaped death, now found release from the prison into which he had been cast. In Persia persecution continued with varying severity, and continually was the Bábí colony at Baghdad recruited by exiles forced to fly from their own homes. Every effort was made by the Persian authorities to molest and injure the fugitives, who, as a last resource, enrolled themselves as Turkish subjects. By this device they at length obtained some peace and security, for, whatever prejudiced persons may assert to the contrary, the Turkish Government is on the whole both tolerant and just, at all events in comparison with Persia. For twelve years, then, the Bábí leaders dwelt here, engaged in writing, codifying, and diffusing their religion, and exhorting their followers to refrain from all resistance to the authorities and, by virtuous lives, patient resignation, and kindly dealing with all men, to commend their faith to the whole world. So far did they succeed that from the year 1852 until the present time, the Bábís have patiently and unresistingly submitted to all the persecutions which they have suffered and still do suffer.

In the year 1864, the Persian Government induced the Turkish authorities to transfer the Bábí exiles farther from their frontier—first to Constantinople and then to Adrianople. Now while they were at Adrianople a great event took place, which had the effect of dividing the Bábís into two antagonistic parties. *Subh-i-Ezel*, as I have explained, had hitherto been generally acknowledged as the legitimate successor of the Báb, and the visible head of the Bábí faith. But, as I have also explained, the Báb had declared that his revelation was not final, and that he would, at some future time not specified, be succeeded by "Him whom God shall manifest." It was generally believed that this new manifestation would not take place for at least a thousand years, ere the lapse of which many countries should have accepted the religion of the Báb. At the same time the Báb had laid it down that the time of this promised deliverer's advent was known only to God, that no one could falsely claim to be him, that he would appear

suddenly and unexpectedly, and that when he appeared the fullest authority to confirm or annul, to bind or to loose, was his indisputable prerogative. So, when Behá'u'lláh suddenly declared that he was their promised deliverer, whose manifestation they so eagerly expected, and warned all the Bábís not to remain "veiled," as the Muhammadans had done, the greater number at once acknowledged his authority, received his words as divinely inspired, and yielded to him an implicit and unqualified submission. So for these Behá'ís, as they are now called, the writings of the Báb became an old testament, and the ordinances of the Beyán an abrogated law. But not all of the Bábís were content to accept this superseding of a law not yet much more than twenty years old. Šubḥ-i-Ezel himself declined to acknowledge Behá'u'lláh's claim, or to abdicate in his favour, and a minority of the Bábís (now called Ezels) refused to withdraw their allegiance from him or acknowledge another chief. Dissensions naturally arose, which culminated in the interference of the Turkish government and the final separation of the rival heads. Šubḥ-i-Ezel was sent to Famagusta in Cyprus, and Behá'u'lláh to Acre in Syria, and there they remain to the present day, the former surrounded by a very few, the latter by many devoted adherents. Less than a year ago I visited both places, and heard both sides of a long and tangled controversy. But the upshot of the whole matter is, that out of every hundred Bábís probably not more than three or four are Ezels, all the rest accepting Behá'u'lláh as the final and most perfect manifestation of the Truth.

Having now traced very briefly the later history of the sect, I must add some few words as to the most salient features of their faith. To discuss this fully would need more time than has been allotted to me altogether, and I am therefore forced to enumerate such points as have not already been alluded to in the merest outline. God—one, eternal, incomprehensible—reveals to man so much as he can apprehend of truth by means of an endless but intermittent succession of prophets. The essence of their teaching is, in reality, one and the same; for the same universal wisdom speaks, and the same divine will acts through all of them. But as man advances and evolves his latent potentialities, he needs a fuller light, and can bear a clearer teaching. We tell a child that knowledge is sweet. "Is it sweet like sugar?" it asks. And we, because we wish to teach it to love knowledge, are compelled to speak in that language which it can understand, and which, to it, is the nearest approach to absolute truth attainable, and answer, "Yes; sweet like sugar." So it is with man, for the human race has an infancy, a childhood, a youth, a maturity. And now, in its maturity, those illustrative sufficient for and adapted to its infancy are no longer suitable. Heaven is true, but it is a state, not a place. "If to-day any one believes in the Beyán," says the Báb, "he is seated on a throne of glory, though he be seated in the dust." So too wherever an unbeliever dwells, there is the "Land of Fire." There is a resurrection, but it is not that which men have imagined; each "manifestation" of the divine wisdom in human form is

the "resurrection" of that which preceded it, wherein the fruit is reaped of the seed then sown. That is the "judgment," that is the "meeting with God," and the angels are the reapers who go forth to gather in what is ripe and good. And thus it is that, according to whether they are addressing a Muhammadan, a Christian, or a Jew, the Bábís say that the *Imán Mahdí* has come, that Christ has returned, or that Moses has reappeared on earth; for to them all these phrases signify the same thing. As to the belief in a future life, it is there, but it is not prominent. A universal reign of peace, love, freedom, and unity of belief and effort is the thing, primarily aimed at; for Bábism, in spite of the mystic enthusiasm which pervades it, differs from Súfism in the essentially practical objects which it has in view. A material resurrection is denied, and the immaterial future of the spirit must not divert our thoughts from the work of regenerating the world. War must cease, nations must mingle in friendship, justice must become universal, all men must be as brothers. "Ye are all the fruit of one tree," says Behá, "and the leaves of one branch. Walk, then, with perfect charity, concord, affection, and agreement, for I swear by the Sun of Truth that the light of agreement shall brighten and illumine the horizons." So again he says, "Pride is not for him who loveth his country, but rather for him who loveth the whole world." "As for those who commit sin and cling to the world," he says elsewhere, "they are assuredly not of the people of Behá." "Religious hatred and rancour is a world-consuming fire," we read in another place, "and the quenching thereof most arduous, unless the hand of Divine Might give man deliverance from this unfruitful calamity." People of all creeds are to be associated with in a fair and friendly spirit, not shunned as unclean or treated as foes. Persuasion may be used to gain converts, but the employment of force is hateful to God. "If ye be slain, it is better for you than that ye should slay." The diffusion of knowledge is a most laudable thing, for, says Behá, "he who educateth his son, or one of the sons of another, it is as though he had educated one of my sons." But studies like logic and philosophy, which conduce only to disputation, are discouraged. The study of living languages is, on the other hand, encouraged, since it conduces to the closer union of diverse peoples. It is, however, recommended that in course of time one language (either one of those at present existing, or a new universal language) and one writing be chosen by the assembled representatives of the different nations, and that these be taught to every one, so that thenceforth there may be no obstacle to the free intercourse of all mankind.

I trust that I have told you enough to make it clear that the objects at which this religion aims are neither trivial nor unworthy of the noble self-devotion and heroism of the Founder and his followers. It is the lives and deaths of these, their hope which knows no despair, their love which knows no cooling, their steadfastness which knows no wavering, which stamp this wonderful movement with a character entirely its own. For whatever may

be the merits or demerits of the doctrines for which these scores and hundreds of our fellow-men died, they have at least found something which made them ready to

"leave all things under the sky,
And go forth naked under sun and rain,
And work and wait and watch out all their years."

It is not a small or easy thing to endure what these have endured, and surely what they deemed worth life itself is worth trying to understand. I say nothing of the mighty influence which, as I believe, the Bábí faith will exert in the future, nor of the new life it may perchance breathe into a dead people; for, whether it succeed or fail, the splendid heroism of the Bábí martyrs is a thing eternal and indestructible.

"He whose soul by love is quickened never can to death be hurled;
Written is their life immortal in the records of the world."

But what I cannot hope to have conveyed to you is the terrible earnestness of these men, and the indescribable influence which this earnestness, combined with other qualities, exerts on any one who has actually been brought in contact with them. That you must take my word for, or else—

*"Chú dar rah bi-bíni burídi sari,
Kí ghaltán shavad sú-yi-meydán-i-md,
Asi purs, asi purs asrár-i-md,
Kazi bishnavi sirr-i-panhán-i-md."*

"When thou seest in the path a severed head
Which is rolling towards our field,
Ask of it, ask of it our secrets,
For from it thou may'st hear our hidden mystery." ¹

¹ From the *Diván* of Shams-i-Tabriz.

THE RELIGIONS OF ANCIENT AMERICA.

By JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

IN the study of the native religions of North and South America, there is a special attraction bound up with the special perplexity of the subject. These religions, like the races which have held them, seem to stand historically apart from the rest of humanity, unrelated, underived, independent. The first question that occurs to the ethnologist when he looks at the native American races is, How and when did they get there? With which of the other human families are they most nearly connected? And though in the past this question used to be put on the traditional assumption of an original creation of one human pair, from whom all mankind are descended, it is still perfectly relevant to the present state of science, since the most plausible and economical hypothesis in regard to human evolution is that the development of early man from some apelike form went on, however slowly, over one particular area, and not independently in widely separate parts of the world at the same time. That is to say, in the present state of knowledge, we still surmise a unity in the human race, and hesitate to believe that different human species were independently evolved from lower forms in different continents, acquiring the same physical structure under widely varying conditions.

It is therefore perfectly fitting that ethnologists should try to see if they cannot trace a connection between the native races of America and the races of Asia, which are the nearest to them in geographical position. Until that hypothesis is either established or overthrown, our anthropology and our moral science must remain in large part unsettled. Dr. Réville, who seven years ago delivered a course of lectures for the Hibbert Trustees on the American religions, argues that "we may safely leave to ethnologists the task of deciding whether the whole human race descends from one original couple or from many; for, spiritually speaking, humanity in any case is one. It is one same spirit that animates it and is developed in it; and this, the incontestable unity of our race, is likewise the only unity we need care to insist on."¹ But it is clear—and the phraseology betrays the fact—that this defines rather the theological than the scientific attitude; for the very question whether an alleged spiritual unity is independent of a biological or genealogical unity, is one of the preliminary problems of true "spiritual" science. And Dr. Réville furnishes other proofs that moral science needs for its proper cultivation another method and another bias than is set up by a theological training.

¹ Hibbert Lectures, 1884, on the Native Religions of Mexico and Peru, p. 40.

As we go into detail, we shall see some remarkable coincidences between American and Asiatic and European religious systems; and until we determine whether the different peoples branched off from one common stock, after it had grown definitely human, our notions of mental evolution must remain open to much vicissitude. Dr. Réville is prepared to set down all resemblances to a natural law or logic of human nature. But our conception of that natural law must alter a good deal according as we decide that certain peculiar superstitions and ritual practices were reached alike by various races who grew separately out of pre-human species, and these out of still lower species, in different parts of the world, without intermixture; or decide that the whole of the man-like family developed inter-connectedly over one area, and that the different races now existing did not branch off from the central stem till they had already acquired what we call human characteristics—that is, until they had reached the stage of using weapons and fire.

Suppose, for instance, that the American races came some thousands of years ago from Asia, and that they are kindred to the earlier Asiatic races: they would already have a body of myths and a certain religious bias in common with peoples whose descendants subsist in Asia; and the coincidences in their religion would have to be pronounced historical, that is, they represent a sequence of phenomena substantially determined by one original set of conditions within a given era and territory. If, on the other hand, you suppose that evolution proceeded in different parts of the planet on identical lines from the lowest forms of life through many others, up to the anthropoid and the human,¹ your whole conception of evolutionary law is affected, and that in turn must affect your philosophy. In fine, we must take account of *all* phenomena, *all* science, in forming our philosophy, if that is to be scientific; and the method of Dr. Réville, though an improvement on that of the churches, must be dismissed as incomplete.

Now, I will suggest to you the high probability—I do not call it more—that the American races did come from Asia not very many thousands of years ago by way of Behring's Straits² in the extreme north, at a time when men had already learned the primary arts of civilization. Of course that may represent a very distant antiquity indeed; for we must allow

¹ As to the possibility of such an evolution in America, Haeckel gives an emphatic negative. Putting the two hypotheses of immigration from north-east Asia and from Polynesia, he adds: "In any case the original inhabitants of America came from the Old World, and are certainly not, as some suppose, evolved from American apes. Catarrhine or small-nosed apes have at no period existed in America." *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 2te Aufl. S. 613. The fact that men are so much alike in the two hemispheres, while the animals are so widely different, seems in itself decisive.

² See Oscar Peschel's "Races of Man," Eng. tr. p. 400, ff. At Behring's Straits Asia and America are within sight of each other. And if we suppose a migration of tribes like the Kamtskadals, who easily bear extreme cold, being but slightly civilized, we dispose of all such difficulties as the suggestion that pastoral Mongols would never have crossed without some of their animals. Prescott, however, remarks that "it would be easy for the inhabitant of Eastern Tartary or Japan to steer his course from islet to islet, quite across to the American shore, without ever being on the ocean more than two days at a time." "Conquest of Mexico," App. Part I.

greater and greater periods for evolution as we go back from the stage of tribal savagery to those in which men would be, from our point of view, only doubtfully human. But though the difficulty of proving affinities of language between American and Asiatic races is great, and we seem thus bound to suppose a very remote separation indeed; on the other hand, the observed facts as to the rapid changes of language among South Sea islanders, when isolated from each other, go to suggest that very wide deviation may occur in a few thousands of years among people of one stock who have separated at a stage in which they have no literature, no word signs, and only the merest beginnings of a ritual. Beyond this hypothesis we need not go. The question is one for the solution of which we have not yet sufficient materials,¹ since we have yet to cultivate properly many of the lines of research on which that solution must depend; and it must be admitted that some ethnologists have thus far come to their conclusions in a sufficiently irresponsible fashion. It has been said of Pickering, for instance, that he set up a connection between the Malay and the Californian because each had an open countenance, one wife, and no tomahawk.² Happily we need not resort to such inductions as these. Nor need we be deterred from the scientific search by the fact that some of the guesses made have been wildly absurd. There is said to be widely current in Peru a legend, fully believed by the natives, that the name of the first Inca, Manco Capac, arose in the actual advent of a shipwrecked Englishman, who got to be known as *Ingasman*, and who married the daughter of one *Cocapac*, his son being accordingly called *Ingasman Cocapac*, whence the name and title *Inca Manco Capac*.³ That is funny enough; but we need not therefore proceed with Dr. Réville dogmatically to decide that "*everything shows that the civilizations of Mexico and Peru are autochthonous, springing from the soil itself.*"⁴ To make a statement like that, without any biological evidence on which to found it, is no more reasonable than the method of happy-go-lucky guess.

We cannot linger, however, over this side of the question; and indeed we can here only glance at one which lies closer to our main theme—that,

¹ A number of extraordinary correspondences, however, have been traced—that, for instance, between the Aztec calendar signs and the Mongolian zodiac. "The symbols in the Mongolian calendar are borrowed from animals. Four of the twelve are the same as the Aztec. Three others are as nearly the same as the different species of animals in the two hemispheres would allow. The remaining five refer to no creature then found in Anahuac. The resemblance went as far as it could." (Prescott, App. i.) Such a correspondence must be allowed to count for much. A line of investigation that might be worth pursuing is suggested by the similarities of Mexican employment of colour in art with Chinese and Japanese methods. There is also a curious similarity in the folding of Mexican and Japanese books. But that, it must be admitted, would suggest a later separation than has been above surmised. The same may be said of the parallels in astronomical science.

² H. H. Bancroft, "Native Races of the Pacific States," i. 24.

³ W. B. Stevenson, "Twenty Years' Residence in South America," 1825, i. 394-6. Stevenson gives the story as a purely native invention.

⁴ Lectures cited, p. 242. Dr. Réville, singularly enough, mentions all the weak guesses, but does not allude to that of a migration by Behring's Straits.

namely, of the connection of the different peoples of Ancient America with each other. For among these there is fully as much variation as is found among the peoples of Europe. To go no farther, the Aztecs or Mexicans differ noticeably in certain physical characteristics from the Redskins; and these again show considerable variations of type. A decisive theory of the culture-histories of these peoples cannot yet be constructed, inasmuch as we are still very much in the dark as to the civilizations which existed in Central and South America before those of Mexico and Peru. For the title of this lecture, "The Religions of *Ancient America*," is only designed to mark off the religions flourishing so lately as four hundred years ago, and the aboriginal religions still existing, from that Christian religion which was introduced into Mexico and Peru by the Spaniards, and into North America by the English and French. The two religious systems we have chiefly to consider, the Mexican and Peruvian as they existed before the Spanish Conquest, are not very ancient in their developed form; because even the two civilizations were comparatively modern. The Aztecs and the Peruvians only professed to date back a few centuries from the Conquest; and in both Peru and Mexico there were and still are the architectural remains of civilizations, some of which were themselves so ancient¹ as to be unintelligible to the nations found by the Spaniards. Thus, near Lake Titicaca in Peru² there are remains of structures which by their size suggested giant builders, the work of a race of whom the Incas had no knowledge; and yet further there are remains, of rude circles of standing stones which presumably belonged to a primitive civilization more ancient still. So in Mexico, there are ancient remains such as those at Palanque, which suggest a civilization higher, on the side of art and architecture, and at the same time much older, than that of the Aztecs.³ All we can say with any safety is that, as it was put by Buckle, the earlier civilizations grew up in those regions where there were combined the conditions of a regular, easy, and abundant food supply, namely, heat and moisture, without an overwhelming proportion of the latter, such as occurs in Brazil. Now, from the point of view of the needs of an early civilization, the golden mean occurs, in South America, only in the territories which were covered by the empire of the Incas, and farther north, from the Isthmus of Panama to Mexico. We surmise then a long-continued movement of population southwards, one wave pushing on another ahead of it, till some reached Patagonia. After a time, however, there might be refluxes. It is admitted that Mexican tradition points to early developments of civilization about the Isthmus and Central America, and then waves of migration and conquest northwards. And then, in accordance with the law that an already civilized people can get good results out of a territory which could not originate a civilization,⁴ it

¹ See E. B. Tylor ("Anahuac," p. 189), as to the pre-Toltec civilization of Mexico.

² Squier, "Peru," 1877, ch. 20.

³ Baheroft, iv. 289-346.

⁴ Dr. Tylor ("Anahuac," p. 192) has some remarks on this head, to which I can attach no definite meaning.

may have been that some of these early nations were driven north of Mexico, and so established those forgotten States of which the mysterious and fascinating remains have been discovered in modern times. And it may have been that the people called the Toltecs, who flourished in Mexico before the Aztecs, represented yet again a backflow of one of these peoples from the north, according to the tradition.¹ All that we know is, that Mexico remained the seat of the most flourishing empires, mainly because it could best yield an abundant and regular supply of vegetable food, as maize; and that when Cortès invaded it, the civilization of the Aztecs, who constituted the greatest of the several Mexican States then existing, was among the most remarkable.²

And herein lies the fascination of these civilizations, with their religions, that they supply us with a set of results practically independent of all the known history of Europe and Asia. It has been remarked that the great drawback of most of the mental or human sciences is that they do not admit of experiments as do the physical sciences. You must take the phenomena you get and try to account for them, with no aid from planned repetitions of cases. But, on the other hand, the human sciences have an enormous wealth of data lying ready to hand, and some departments of these data have for us the effect of new revelations in human affairs. After we become absorbed in the conception of European civilization, with its beginnings, on the one hand in Aryan barbarism, on the other in the Eastern and Egypto-Semitic culture, we seem to be shut up to a certain body of conclusions about human nature and its tendencies of thought and action. What is much worse, we have the conclusions presented to us ready made in terms of the reigning religion, which takes all previous life as so much preparation, planned by a sagacious Deity, for its own particular way of looking at life; and when we determine to think out matters on some saner principle, we find our path cumbered at every step by falsified records and prejudiced evidence. We can hardly touch ancient civilization without stirring the mud which Christian propaganda has thrown at it, or the dust which the same spirit has elsewhere allowed to cover it. But when we go to the records of the cultures and creeds of Mexico and Peru, records wonderfully preserved in the teeth of the fanaticism which would have destroyed them all if it could, we stand clear of the frauds and prejudices alike of Jew and Christian; we are in a measure spared the eternal contrast between pretended monotheism and polytheism, the eternal suggestion of the possible diffusion of revealed truth,³ the perpetual comparison between

¹ Compare ch. I. of Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico," and J. F. Kirk's notes on it (Sonnenstein's edition) with Réville, Lect. i. But the tradition may also derive from the general movement of population southwards.

² The Tezucan civilization seems to have been more intellectual than that of Mexico proper. See Prescott, B. I. c. 6, end.

³ That is, now. Lord Kingsborough wrought hard in the last generation to prove that the Biblical system was known to the Mexicans; and there was an early theory that

Christendom and Paganism. We are faced by a civilization and a religion that reached wealth and complexity by a free growth from the stage of early savagery, without ever coming in contact with that of Asia and Europe till the moment of collision and destruction. And to study these American civilizations aright is to learn with clearness lessons in sociology, or human science in general, which otherwise could only have been reached imperfectly and with difficulty. The culture-histories of the two hemispheres, put side by side, illuminate each other as do the facts of comparative anatomy.

The history of the Old World has taught us how large a part is played by religion in human affairs, how much of men's intellectual energy tends to be spent on hallucinations in the absence of knowledge; but nowhere is this truth so palpable as in old Mexico and Peru. If we can trust the Spanish writers,¹ five thousand priests were connected with the principal temple in the city of Mexico alone, where there were in all some 600 temples, and where the total population was perhaps about 300,000;² and all the cities were divided into districts placed under the charge of parochial clergy, who regulated all acts of religion. In this enormous strength of the priestly class we have the secret of that frightful development of religious delusion and its attendant atrocity which marks off Mexico from the rest of the world. The system was, of course, Polytheistic, and equally of course, it exhibits the usual tendency towards Monotheism; but the overwhelming priesthood necessarily perpetuated the separate cults. There were at least thirteen principal deities, and more than two hundred inferior,³ who would answer to the genii and saints of Europe; and it is obvious that in Mexico as in Christendom there must have been many varieties of religious temper and attitude. In many of the forms of prayer and admonition which have been preserved,⁴ we see a habit of alluding reverently to "God" or "our Lord," without any specification of any one deity, and with a general assumption that the Lord loves right conduct. This universal God was in origin just the Sun, who was worshipped in the temples of all the gods alike, being prayed to four times each day and four times each night.⁵

Different deities, however, were invoked in different circumstances: for instance, in connection with the rite of infant baptism, which the Mexicans practised most scrupulously, the officiating women prayed to "Our Merciful Lady," Chalchiuhtlicue or Cioacoatl, the Goddess of Water.⁶ At the season when rain was wanted for the harvest, again, prayer was

¹ St. Thomas, that ubiquitous missionary, had given them Christianity. Prescott, pp. 33, 641. Clavigero, B. vi. c. 4.

² Clavigero, "History of Mexico," B. vi. ch. 14 (Eng. tr. 1807, vol. i. p. 270).

³ Prescott, as cited, pp. 32, 283-4. Torquemada thought there might be 40,000 temples in all Mexico, and Clavigero held there were many more. B. vi. ch. 12 (p. 269).

⁴ Prescott, B. i. c. 3, p. 27.

⁵ Sahagun, "Hist. of the Affairs of New Spain," French trans., 1880 *passim*.

⁶ Réville, as cited, p. 46.

⁷ Sahagun, as cited, p. 441 (l. ii. c. 32).

made to the god or gods named Tlaloc¹—for both the singular and plural forms are used—who controlled the rain; and whereas the Goddess of Water invoked at baptism was held merciful, the Tlaloc had to be propitiated by the regular sacrifice of a number of sucking infants, bought from poor parents or extorted from superstitious ones.² And there is no more awful illustration of the capacity of the human mind for religious delusion than the record of how the merciful people, believing in the efficacy of the sacrifice, would yet keep out of the way of the sacred procession which carried the doomed babes, because they could not bear to see them weep and think of their fate; while others, weeping themselves, would take comfort if the children wept freely, because that prognosticated plentiful rains.³

At the first glance it is plain that the Mexican pantheon represented the myths of many tribes, myths which overlapped each other, as in the case of the God of Rain and his wife the Goddess of Water, and which survived separately by being adapted to the different usages of life. Men could not sacrifice infants to the very deity invoked at baptism; so the benign Water-Goddess was sundered from the child-devouring Water-God. And by the same law it came about that the most prominent of the worshipers of Mexico, a state periodically at war, was that of the War-God Huitzilopochtli, who figured as the patron God of the State.

This God's name, as we have it, means "humming-bird on the left," and is explained by the fact that the hideous image of the God had the feathers of a humming-bird on the left foot. Dr. Réville explains that the humming-bird is mystically a bird of the sun, being called by the Aztecs "sunbeam" or "sun's hair"; and that it is associated with Huitzilopochtli in his primary character of Sun-God. But that is only part of the explanation, as Dr. Réville shows. Huitzilopochtli is a Sun-God; but he is the God of the Spring and Summer Sun, there being another great deity, his brother Tezcatlipoca, who rules the winter months. Huitzilopochtli's reign began in May; and it is in May, the spring-month, that in Mexico the humming bird appears. It is probably this association that specially connects him with the God.

Now, there is a remarkable coincidence between this symbolism and that which, in the Roman mythology, connects Mars, the War-God, with the wood-pecker.⁴ From the name of the bird, Lat. *picus*, he was held to have had the pet-name *Picumnus*;⁵ and this circumstance encourages the

¹ Probably "the Tlalocs," were the clouds—children of the rain—God. Réville, p. 72. Tlaloc was one of the oldest deities. Prescott, p. 41, n., citing Ramirez.

² Sahagun, as cited, p. 84 (l. ii. c. 20) speaks of purchase only. There seem, however, to have been special dedications. In Carthage, we know, the aristocracy came to substitute bought children for their own. Diodorus xx. 14. The same process would take place anywhere.

³ Sahagun, p. 58 (l. ii. c. 1), and pp. 84-7.

⁴ Preller, "Römische Mythologie," ed. 1865, S. 297-8.

⁵ This derivation, however, is disputed. Cox, "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," ed. 1882, pp. 523-4.

surmise which we naturally make that Huitzilopochtli is not the original name of the Mexican God,¹ but only a sobriquet or pet-name by which the people described him, in terms of his symbolic image. Dr. Réville does not mention this analogy; and it would be interesting to know how he would explain it. He is wont to insist strongly that parallels in mythology do not mean borrowing; and in this case I believe it would be right to say so. But the explanation, as I regard it, is somewhat curious. A War-God, specially known as such, is not a primary conception: what happens is that a particular God comes to be the God of war. Now, we know, that Mars was originally a sylvan deity,² concerned with vegetation and flocks and herds. How came he to preside over war? Simply because, I take it, he was the God of *the season at which war was usually made*. Campaigns were begun in spring; and so the God of the Spring season, who was specially invoked, became War-God. Mars was just *Martius*, March; and he lent himself the better to the conception, because March is a blowy and blustering month. Mars, you remember, retains these characteristics, being a blustering rather than a great or dignified God in both the Greek and Roman mythologies. As in Italy, so in Mexico. The God of the war-season became the God of War; and the one deity like the other retained, as War-God, the symbol of the little bird which was held to be his forerunner in nature. *Picus* means speckled,³ coloured; and the speckled woodpecker might figure the coming of speckled spring, as the humming-bird would do the colour-time in Mexico.⁴ Perhaps there may be a similar natural explanation for the coincidence that Huitzilopochtli is born of a mother, Coatlicue, who is abnormally impregnated by being touched by a ball of bright-coloured feathers,⁵ while Juno bears Mars also virginally, being impregnated by the touch of a flower.⁶

But a great difference arises between the cults of Mars and Huitzilopochtli in respect of development. The Roman God remained subordinate, warlike though the Romans were; the Mexican became one of the two leading deities, and received the more assiduous worship. Whence the divergence? Mainly, I take it, from the multiplication of the Mexican priesthood and the special form of their cultus. It is to their enormous power, in the first place, that we must attribute the fearful multiplication of human sacrifices. These, there is abundant reason to believe, have existed in all religions at one stage; and it has depended on the presence or

¹ He was, in fact, identical with the God Mexitli. Prescott, p. 9.

² Cato, "De re Rustica," 141 (142). Mars, too, was identified with the sun. Macrobius, "Saturnalia," l. 19. So was Arés, according to Preller ("Griech. Myth.," ed. 1860, l. 257), who, however, only cites the Homeric hymn, which does not bear him out. That identifies Arés with the planet Mars.

³ So White. Bréal derives it from a root meaning to strike. Cox, as cited.

⁴ Dr. Réville notes that the humming-bird is specially courageous. The same view might be taken of the woodpecker.

⁵ Clavigero, B. vi. c. 6 (p. 254).

⁶ Ovid, "Fasti," v. 231-256.

absence of a powerful priesthood whether they are obsolutely continued or abandoned. It may or may not be, as Professor Robertson Smith argues, that human sacrifices are not more ancient than those of animals, but arise late, after men have ceased to regard animals as equally belonging to the tribe with themselves.¹ What we do know is that, where there is only a limited priesthood, the natural force of compassion leads men in time, as they grow more civilized, to abandon such sacrifices; while a priesthood tends to maintain and multiply them. Thus among the civilized peoples of the old world they lasted longest with the priest-ridden Carthaginians;² and the reason that they did not continue late among the Jews, was that these did not possess a numerous priesthood till after the Captivity, when their religion was recast in terms of the higher Oriental systems. The process is perfectly intelligible. The stronghold of all priesthoods is the principle of intercession; whether it be in the form of simple prayer and propitiatory worship; or a mixture of that with a doctrine of mystic sacrifice, as among Protestants; or in the constant repetition of a ceremony of mystic sacrifice, as among Catholics; or in actual animal sacrifice, as among Jews and Pagans. In these cases we see that, the more stress is laid on the act of sacrifice, the stronger is the priesthood—or we may put it conversely. Strongest of all then must be the hold of the priesthood whose sacrifices are most terrible. And terrible was the prestige of the priesthood of Mexico. The greater and richer the State grew, the larger were the hecatombs of human victims. Almost every God had to be propitiated in the same way; but above all must the War-God be for ever glutted with the smoking hearts of slain captives. Scarcely any historian, says Prescott,³ estimates the number of human beings sacrificed yearly throughout the empire at less than 20,000, and some make it 50,000. Of this doomed host, Huitzilopochtli had the lion's share; and it is recorded that at the dedication of his great new temple in 1486 there were slain in his honour 70,000 prisoners of war, who had been reserved for the purpose for years throughout the empire. They formed a train two miles long, and the work of priestly butchery went on for several days.

At every festival of the God there was a new hecatomb of victims. Conceive how the chronic spectacle burnt itself in on the imagination of the people. The Mexican temples were great pyramids, sometimes of four or five stories, and the sacrifices were offered on the top. The stair was so made that it mounted successively all four sides of the pyramid, and when the train of torch-bearing priests wound their way up in the darkness, as was the rule for certain sacrifices,⁴ to the topmost platform, with its ever-burning fires and its stone of sacrifice, the whole city looked

¹ "The Religion of the Semites," p. 346. It seems a reasonable presumption that cannibalism was practised in connexion with war among savages of all races. The religious element might be super-added.

² On this, however, comp. F. W. Newman, "Miscellanies," pp. 302-3.

³ As cited, B. I., c. 3, p. 38. ⁴ Bancroft ii. 334.

on. And then the horror of the sacrificial act! In the great majority of the sacrifices the victim was laid living on the convex stone and held by the limbs, while the slayer cut open his breast with the sacred flint¹ knife—the ancient knife, used before men had the use of metals, and therefore most truly religious—and tore out the palpitating heart, which was held on high to the all-seeing sun, before being set to burn in incense in front of the idol, whose lips, and the walls of whose shrine, were devoutly daubed with blood.

Ritual and mystery lent their artistic glamour to the process of butchery. In connexion with one annual festival of Tezcatlipoca, the Creator and "soul of the world,"² who combined the attributes of perpetual youthful beauty with the function of the God of justice and retribution, as Winter Sun, there was selected for immolation a young male captive of especial beauty, who was treated with great reverence for a whole year before being sacrificed. He was gorgeously attired; flowers were strewn before him; he went about followed by a retinue of the king's pages; and the people prostrated themselves before him and worshipped him as a God. He was in fact the God's representative, and was described as his image.³ A month before the fatal day new indulgences were heaped upon him. Four beautiful maidens, bearing the names of the principal Goddesses, were given him as concubines. At length came his death day. His honours and his joys were ended, and his fine raiment taken away. Carried on a royal barge across the lake to a particular temple, about a league from the city, whither all the people thronged, he was led up the pyramid in procession, he taking part in the ritual by throwing away his chaplets of flowers and breaking his guitar. And then at the top, the six black-robed slayers, the sacrificial stone, and the horror of the end.⁴ And when all was over the priests piously improved the occasion, preaching that all this had been typical of human destiny.⁵

The Goddesses too had their victims—women victims; and one maiden was prepared for one sacrifice to the Maize-Goddess Centeotl, the Mexican Ceres, somewhat as the representative of Tezcatlipoca was. Some of the ritual horrors of the slaying will hardly bear telling; they are sickening even to read.⁶ But we cannot ignore the special and peculiar horror of the Mexican cultus—the act of ritual cannibalism. This was strictly a

¹ Or rather, obsidian, a volcanic mineral.

² It is remarkable that the doctrine of the Logos is here developed in connexion with the Winter Sun, who would presumably be born at the winter solstice (when the reign of Huizilopochtli ended) and pass away at the vernal equinox. Tezcatlipoca was nominally the "greatest God" (Clavigero, B. vi., c. 2, p. 244), though Huizilopochtli got more attention. "Tezcatlipoca was the most sublime figure in the Aztec Pantheon" (Dr. Brinton, "American Hero Myths," 1882, p. 69). See his titles (*Id.* p. 70). He was the Night God (p. 71); and Clavigero notes that his statue was of black stone.

³ Sahagun, p. 97 (b. ii., c. 24).

⁴ His limbs were sacramentally eaten by the aristocracy.

⁵ Sahagun, as cited.

⁶ See Bancroft iii., 354-7; or Sahagun, pp. 134-5 (b. ii., ch. 30), as to the slaying of victims and donating of their skins, for instance.

matter of religion. After a captive had been sacrificially slain in ordinary course, his body was delivered to the warrior who captured him, and was by him made the special dish at a formal and decorous public banquet to his friends. It was part of the prescribed worship of the Gods. That the Mexicans were not cannibals by taste is shown by the fact that in the great siege by Cortés they died of starvation by thousands. They never ate each other:¹ only the sacrificially slain captive. But only a great priesthood could have maintained even that usage. There are signs that such ritual cannibalism has existed at one time in all religions: the memory of it survives in Christian formulas: and Dr. Réville points out that it must have originated in simple cannibalism, for men would never have begun to offer to the Gods food that was abominable to themselves.² On the other hand, however, we know that cannibalism everywhere dies out naturally even among savages, apart from religion, as soon as they reach some degree of peaceful life, and even sooner. Among the native tribes of Lower California, though they are among the most degraded savages in the world, and given to various disgusting practices, the eating, not only of human flesh, but of that of monkeys, as resembling men, is held abominable.³ And no amount of passion for war could have kept the civilized Aztecs complacently practising ritual cannibalism if an austere and all-powerful priesthood had not fanatically enforced it. The great sanction for human sacrifice, with the Mexicans as with the Khonds in India, was the doctrine which identified the God with the victim, and as it were sacrificed him to himself.⁴ The principle was thus in a peculiar degree priest-made.

The recital of these facts may lead some to conclude that the Mexican priesthood must have been the most atrocious multitude of miscreants the world ever saw. But that would be a complete misconception: they were as conscientious a priesthood as history bears record of.

Apart from the vast priesthood of human sacrifices, there was a body attached to the worship of the benign deity Quetzalcoatl, "Feathered Serpent," the God of the Air,⁵ who appears to have been a God of the Toltec people, driven out by the Aztecs, but whose worship was retained by the latter, among whom no doubt many Toltecs were absorbed. It

¹ It would perhaps be more accurate to say that the eating of a slain enemy was originally part of a process of triumphing over him; and that the abstention from the flesh of fellow-citizens meant not distaste for human flesh (which is negated by the ritual practice), but obedience to a moral veto on domestic cannibalism, such as must have been set up early in all civilizations. Cf. Bancroft, ii. 358.

² Lectures cited, p. 87.

³ Bancroft, i. 360. But it is not certain whether this veto applies to enemies. Professor Robertson Smith thinks the horror of human flesh arose in superstition as to its "sacrosanct character," but does not explain. "Religion of the Semites," p. 348.

⁴ As to the eschatological character of this identification, see Bancroft, iii. 342. "Of the human sacrifices of rude peoples, those of the Mexicans are perhaps the most instructive, for in them the theanthropic character of the victim comes out most clearly" (Prof. Robertson Smith, as cited, p. 347). Generally, on this widely important phase of early religion, see Mr. J. G. Frazer's valuable work "The Golden Bough."

⁵ Clavigero, B. vi., c. 4 (p. 248).

admittedly exhibits the highest kind of moral development that a Nature-myth can take.¹ According to Dr. Brinton and Dr. Réville, Quetzalcoatl is the God of the beneficent west-wind, identified with the vanquished Toltec people, so that like them he is driven away by the enmity of other deities, but like the vanishing or slain Sun-God of all mythologies, he is to return again in power and great glory. This myth was probably the main cause of the success of Cortès, for he was at first believed by both people and king to be the good God Quetzalcoatl come back again.² Well, his myth is admittedly a beautiful one; and one writer argues³ that the Mexicans cannot have framed such a high religious conception unless there had been men of the highest moral qualities among them. By such a myth Christians are set vaguely surmising a debt to their own legend; but there is no such thing in the case. As Mr. Bancroft observes, the process is one which has occurred in many mythologies:

"It is everywhere the case among savages, with their national God, that the latter is a nature-deity, who becomes gradually transformed into a national God, then into a national King, high-priest, founder of a religion, and at last ends in being considered a human being. The older and purer the civilization of a people is, the easier it is to recognise the original essence of its national God, in spite of all transformations and disguises. So it is here. Behind the human form of the God glimmers the nature-shape, and the national God is known by, perhaps, all his worshippers as also a nature-deity. From his powerful influence upon nature, he might also be held as creator. The pure human form of this God [Quetzalcoatl] as it appears in the fable, as well as in the image, is not the original, but the youngest. His oldest concrete forms are taken from nature, to which he originally belongs, and have maintained themselves in many attributes. All these symbolize him as the God of fertility, chiefly . . . by means of the beneficial influence of the air."⁴

Now, we know that Quetzalcoatl was held to be averse to human sacrifices,⁵ and we may assume that the best-hearted and sanest Mexicans would incline to his cultus, which was of high, though not the highest standing. But do not let us decide on that account that the other priest-hoods were wholly evil in spirit or even in act. The strangest thing of all is that their frightful system of sacrifice was bound up not only with a strict and ascetic social morality, but with an emphatic humanitarian doctrine. If asceticism be virtue, as Christianity teaches, they cultivated it zealously. There was a Mexican Goddess of Love, and there was of course plenty of vice; but nowhere could men win a higher reputation for sanctity by living in celibacy. Their saints were numerous. They had nearly all the formulas of Christian morality, so called. The priests themselves mostly lived in strict celibacy; and they educated children with the greatest

¹ Dr. Tylor strangely writes: "I am inclined to consider Quetzalcoatl a real personage, and not a mythical one" ("Anahuac," p. 278). It was this deity who was long ago identified with St. Thomas (Clavigero, B. vi., c. 4, p. 250). For the myth see Dr. Brinton, "American Hero Myths," pp. 73-142. In the ritual of the confessional he is called the "father and mother" of the penitent (Sahagun, p. 341; l. vi., c. 7). He, too, is born of a virgin mother (Brinton, p. 90).

² Prescott, B. ii., c. 6; B. iv., c. 5.

³ Mr. Kirk, in note on Prescott, as cited, p. 29.

⁴ "Native Races," iii. 279.

⁵ His priests were white-robed, while those of the bloody cults were robed in black.

vigilance. They taught the people to be peaceful ; to bear injuries with meekness ; to rely on God's mercy and not on their own merits : they taught, like Jesus and the Pagans, that adultery could be committed by the eyes and the heart ; and above all they exhorted men to feed the poor. The public hospitals were carefully attended to, at a time when some Christian countries had none. They had the practice of confession and absolution ; and in the regular exhortation of the confessor there was this formula : " Clothe the naked and feed the hungry, whatever privations it may cost thee ; for remember, their flesh is like thine, and they are men like thee : cherish the sick, for they are the image of God." And in that very same exhortation there was further urged on the penitent the special duty of instantly *procuring a slave for sacrifice to the deity*.¹

What can we say to this ? These men, judged by religious standards, were just like our European typical priesthood. They doubtless had the same temperamental qualities : a strong irrational sense of duty ; a hysterical habit of mind ; a spirit of self-sacrifice ; a passion for asceticism ; and a feeling that sensuous indulgence was revolting. Devoid of moral science, they had plenty of the blind instinct to do right. They devoutly did what their religion told them ; just as Catholic priests have devoutly served the Inquisition. That is one of the central sociological lessons of our subject. The religious element in man, being essentially irrational, may ally itself with either good or evil ; and it is no thanks to religion, properly speaking, that it is ever in any degree identified with good. How comes it that Christianity is not associated with human sacrifice while the Mexican cultus was ? Simply by reason of the different civilizations that went before. In fine, it is civilization that determines the tone of religion, and not the other way. Christianity starts with a doctrine of one act of human sacrifice ; and Christians are specially invited each year at the sacred season to fasten their minds on the horrors of that act. Their ritual keeps up the mystic pretence of the act of ritual cannibalism which of old went with the human sacrifice : they harp on the very words, " body and blood." They mystically eat the body of the slain God. Now this very act was performed by the Mexicans not only literally, as we have seen, but in the symbolic way also. They had a festival in honour of Xiuhtecuti, the God of Fire, the crowning point of which was the making a dough image of the God and *raising it on a cross* ;² which image was

¹ Sahagun, l. vi., c. 7 ; French trans. pp. 342-3 ; Prescott, as cited, p. 33.

² The cross figured in Mexico as a sacred symbol also in connexion with the Rain-God, and was expressly known as the " Tree of our life." Yet Dr. Brinton has confidently decided (" Myths of the New World," p. 96 ; " American Hero Myths," p. 155) that it simply signified, with its four points, the cardinal points and the four winds. This explanation, which is a pure guess, has been dogmatically put forward by several writers, including Dr. Réville (Lectures, p. 38) who, however, like a German hierologist of whom Dr. Brinton complains, does not name the originator of the theory. Yet it is not even plausible. Why should the cardinal points be represented by an *upright* cross ? And why should it be called " Tree of our life " and specially associated with Tlaloc the God of rain ? Were all four winds alike " rain-bringers " ? Certainly the number four figured in Tlaloc's worship (Bancroft iii. 348), but so did the image of the snake.

then climbed for and thrown down, and the fragments eagerly eaten by the crowd as possessing a sacred efficacy.¹ They thought they were brought into union with the God in that fashion. Well, there is some evidence that among the first Christians the Eucharist was sometimes a baked dough image of a child :² and on any view the irresistible presumption is that in all cases alike the symbolical usage grew out of a more ancient practice of ritual cannibalism. Christianity coming among a set of civilized peoples, the symbol became more and more mystical, though the priesthood adhered tenaciously to the doctrine of daily mystical sacrifice. In Mexico, it seems, certain cults had similarly substituted symbolism for actual sacrifice. But the thin end of the wedge was in, so to speak, in the survival of actual human sacrifices ; and the Aztec priesthood drove the wedge further and further in, in virtue of what we may term the master tendency of all religions—the fixation of ideas and usages.

The Aztec empire, remember, was a late growth ; and according to the records, the rise of its great system of human sacrifices only dates back about two hundred years before the Conquest. The Toltecs, we are told, had no such system ; but we have proofs that they had the usage to a certain extent, since they sacrificed boys and maidens to the Rain-God.³ It only needed that the Aztec priesthood should begin with a few human sacrifices to their War-God in order that their own body and the sacrificial system should grow to the most monstrous dimensions. The more piety the more priests ; the more priests the more sacrifices ; and the constant wars of the Aztecs supplied an unending stream of captives for immolation.⁴ In fact, the Aztec kings made a treaty with the neighbouring republic of Tlascala and its confederates, a treaty which was faithfully kept, to the effect that their armies should fight on a given ground at stated seasons, in order that both sides should be able to supply themselves with prisoners for sacrifice. At all other times they were quite friendly ; and the Aztec kings avowedly kept up the relation purely in order to have captives for sacrifice.⁵ An arrangement like that, once set up, would flourish more and more, especially as death in battle was reckoned a sure passport to Paradise ; and the priesthood would at the same time grow ever more and more numerous ; the only limit being the people's power of endurance. And there can be no doubt that the Aztec empire would ultimately have

Is not the more plausible hypothesis that in such a connexion the significance of the cross was phallic ?

¹ Sahagun, pp. 128-133 (l. ii., ch. 29) ; Bancroft, iii., 329-331. There were other ceremonies representing the sacramental eating of the God's image, made of flour mixed with blood. Prescott, App. i., citing Veytia and Acosta.

² See the author's "Christ and Krishna," pp. 75-6. Cp. Professor Robertson Smith as to "a resuscitation of obsolete mysteries among the Jews" (Work cited, p. 339).

³ Prescott, as cited, p. 41, n.

⁴ The priests actually went into battle to help in securing captives, and were conspicuous for their fury. Prescott, p. 39.

⁵ *Id.*, *ib.*

vigilance. They taught the people to be peaceful ; to bear injuries with meekness ; to rely on God's mercy and not on their own merits : they taught, like Jesus and the Pagans, that adultery could be committed by the eyes and the heart ; and above all they exhorted men to feed the poor. The public hospitals were carefully attended to, at a time when some Christian countries had none. They had the practice of confession and absolution ; and in the regular exhortation of the confessor there was this formula : " Clothe the naked and feed the hungry, whatever privations it may cost thee ; for remember, their flesh is like thine, and they are men like thee : cherish the sick, for they are the image of God." And in that very same exhortation there was further urged on the penitent the special duty of instantly *procuring a slave for sacrifice to the deity*.¹

What can we say to this ? These men, judged by religious standards, were just like our European typical priesthood. They doubtless had the same temperamental qualities : a strong irrational sense of duty ; a hysterical habit of mind ; a spirit of self-sacrifice ; a passion for asceticism ; and a feeling that sensuous indulgence was revolting. Devoid of moral science, they had plenty of the blind instinct to do right. They devoutly did what their religion told them ; just as Catholic priests have devoutly served the Inquisition. That is one of the central sociological lessons of our subject. The religious element in man, being essentially irrational, may ally itself with either good or evil ; and it is no thanks to religion, properly speaking, that it is ever in any degree identified with good. How comes it that Christianity is not associated with human sacrifice while the Mexican cultus was ? Simply by reason of the different civilizations that went before. In fine, it is civilization that determines the tone of religion, and not the other way. Christianity starts with a doctrine of one act of human sacrifice ; and Christians are specially invited each year at the sacred season to fasten their minds on the horrors of that act. Their ritual keeps up the mystic pretence of the act of ritual cannibalism which of old went with the human sacrifice : they harp on the very words, " body and blood." They mystically eat the body of the slain God. Now this very act was performed by the Mexicans not only literally, as we have seen, but in the symbolic way also. They had a festival in honour of Xiuhtecutli, the God of Fire, the crowning point of which was the making a dough image of the God and *raising it on a cross* ;² which image was

¹ Sahagun, l. vi., c. 7 ; French trans. pp. 342-3 ; Prescott, as cited, p. 33.

² The cross figured in Mexico as a sacred symbol also in connexion with the Rain-God, and was expressly known as the " Tree of our life." Yet Dr. Brinton has confidently decided (" Myths of the New World," p. 96 ; " American Hero Myths," p. 155) that it simply signified, with its four points, the cardinal points and the four winds. This explanation, which is a pure guess, has been dogmatically put forward by several writers, including Dr. Réville (Lectures, p. 38) who, however, like a German hierologist of whom Dr. Brinton complains, does not name the originator of the theory. Yet it is not even plausible. Why should the cardinal points be represented by an *upright cross* ? And why should it be called " Tree of our life " and specially associated with Tlaloc the God of *rain* ? Were all four winds alike " rain-bringers " ? Certainly the number four figured in Tlaloc's worship (Bancroft iii. 348), but so did the image of the snake.

then climbed for and thrown down, and the fragments eagerly eaten by the crowd as possessing a sacred efficacy.¹ They thought they were brought into union with the God in that fashion. Well, there is some evidence that among the first Christians the Eucharist was sometimes a baked dough image of a child :² and on any view the irresistible presumption is that in all cases alike the symbolical usage grew out of a more ancient practice of ritual cannibalism. Christianity coming among a set of civilized peoples, the symbol became more and more mystical, though the priesthood adhered tenaciously to the doctrine of daily mystical sacrifice. In Mexico, it seems, certain cults had similarly substituted symbolism for actual sacrifice. But the thin end of the wedge was in, so to speak, in the survival of actual human sacrifices ; and the Aztec priesthood drove the wedge further and further in, in virtue of what we may term the master tendency of all religions—the fixation of ideas and usages.

The Aztec empire, remember, was a late growth ; and according to the records, the rise of its great system of human sacrifices only dates back about two hundred years before the Conquest. The Toltecs, we are told, had no such system ; but we have proofs that they had the usage to a certain extent, since they sacrificed boys and maidens to the Rain-God.³ It only needed that the Aztec priesthood should begin with a few human sacrifices to their War-God in order that their own body and the sacrificial system should grow to the most monstrous dimensions. The more piety the more priests ; the more priests the more sacrifices ; and the constant wars of the Aztecs supplied an unfailing stream of captives for immolation.⁴ In fact, the Aztec kings made a treaty with the neighbouring republic of Tlascala and its confederates, a treaty which was faithfully kept, to the effect that their armies should fight on a given ground at stated seasons, in order that both sides should be able to supply themselves with prisoners for sacrifice. At all other times they were quite friendly ; and the Aztec kings avowedly kept up the relation purely in order to have captives for sacrifice.⁵ An arrangement like that, once set up, would flourish more and more, especially as death in battle was reckoned a sure passport to Paradise ; and the priesthood would at the same time grow ever more and more numerous ; the only limit being the people's power of endurance. And there can be no doubt that the Aztec empire would ultimately have

Is not the more plausible hypothesis that in such a connexion the significance of the cross was phallic ?

¹ Sahagun, pp. 128-133 (l. ii., ch. 29) ; Bancroft, *ib.*, 329-331. There were other ceremonies representing the sacramental eating of the God's image, made of flour mixed with blood. Prescott, App. i., citing Veytia and Acosta.

² See the author's "Christ and Krishna," pp. 75-6. Cp. Professor Robertson Smith as to "a resuscitation of obsolete mysteries among the Jews" (Work cited, p. 339).

³ Prescott, as cited, p. 41, n.

⁴ The priests actually went into battle to help in securing captives, and were conspicuous for their fury. Prescott, p. 39.

⁵ *Id.*, *ib.*

broken down under its monstrous burden if the Spaniards had not destroyed it; for the taxation necessary to support the military and aristocratic system alongside of the allocation of enormous untaxed domains¹ to the ever-multiplying myriads of priests was becoming more insupportable year by year, so that the deep disaffection of the common people was one of the chief supports to the campaign of Cortés.² It may well be that some of the previous civilizations had succumbed in the same way, literally destroyed by religion, to the extent, that is, of inviting conquest by less civilized tribes.

In Peru, the same tendencies are seen in a much modified degree. There the rapid multiplication of the priesthood was hindered by the peculiar standing of the king and his family. In Mexico the king was elected by the nobles; in Peru he reigned by divine right of the strongest description; the doctrine being that the original Inca was the Sun-God, who married his sister; and that all succeeding Incas did the same, thus keeping the succession strictly divine. As they extended their dominions by conquest, they astutely provided that the religions of the conquered peoples should subsist, but in a state of recognised subjection to the Inca, the divine high-priest, as the priesthood generally ranked below the sacred caste of the Inca nobles; so that the old cults had not the chance of growing as those of Mexico did, though they remained popular and venerable. The two leading deities were Pachacamac and Viracocha, who seem at times to have been identified. Each figured in myth as a Creator, and they were doubtless originally the Gods of different peoples or tribes, though their cults tended to unity under the politic despotism of the Incas. Pachacamac signifies "life-giver of the earth," and Viracocha, "foam of the sea"; and they seem accordingly to have been respectively associated, to some extent, with the principles of heat and moisture; but, as so many other ancient systems show, these principles readily lend themselves to combination. The omission to build new temples, however,³ was probably undermining this cult; and the popular religion was becoming more and more one of worship of the minor deities, with the Inca figuring as the representative of the chief natural God, the Sun. The Thunder and Lightning were worshipped as the Sun's ministers; the Rainbow as his symbol or emanation; and the Moon and Stars, and in particular the planet Venus, as separate divinities; and Creator, Thunder, and Sun, were sacrificed to as if very much on a level in dignity.⁴ From such developments we may infer that the Peruvian popular culture was nearly stationary or decaying; and it becomes easy to understand how, after the Conquest, the Christian deities took the place of the old without any difficulty; these being so many religious conventions, while the real beliefs of the people remained

¹ Prescott, B. i., c. 3.

² *Id.*, B. ii., c. 6.

³ See Mr. Kirk's note in his ed. of Prescott, p. 44.

⁴ "Rites and Laws of the Incas," trans. by C. R. Markham, Hakluyt Society, 1873, p. 27.

attached, as they are now, to the genii or sprites of their own lore. For an unprogressing and unlettered people—as many of those in Europe have been at different times—religion is mostly a matter of festivals and hand-to-mouth superstitions; and the Peruvian common people are, under Christianity, what they were under their Incas. European life gives abundant evidence of how the usages of an ancient creed may survive the creed itself. In Peru, as in Mexico, there was a solemn religious ceremony of renewing at stated periods, by special generation, the fire used in the temples, and even in the households. In Mexico it was done over a human sacrifice, by means of the friction of two sticks, at the end of each cycle of fifty-two years.¹ In Peru it was done yearly by means of a concave mirror.² So did men do in ancient Rome, and similarly have northern European peasants done in Germany, in Scotland, in Ireland, at intervals till our own time, regarding the “need fire” or “forced fire” as a means of averting evil.³ It is one of the oldest rites of the human race, and it has survived under all religions alike down to the other day, when perhaps it received its death-blow from the lucifer match. Equally universal is that ceremony of annually driving out the evil spirits,⁴ which was undertaken in Peru by the Incas in person, and which I suspect to have survived in Scotland to this day in the burghal ceremony of “riding the marches.” Customary usages and minor superstitions outlast faiths and philosophies; and in Peru they defy the Church. Sun worship is gone; but the ideas of the Incarial times remain. And, indeed, there existed in some districts sixty years ago, and probably survives even to-day, a devout celebration of the memory of the ancient theocracy, in the shape of an annual dramatic representation, which their rulers vainly sought to suppress, of the death of the last Inca at the hands of the Spaniards.⁵

It was about as ill-founded devotion as any ever shown to a royal line in our own hemisphere; for under the Incas the people were heavily oppressed by minutely tyrannous laws and by taxes, they alone bearing all burdens, and the priests and nobles going free.⁶ But were it not for the mistake of the last Inca before Pizarro in recognising one of his sons by a foreign queen, and dividing the empire between him and the heir apparent, the Inca empire, despite the disaffection of some of its subjects by conquest, might have subsisted long. As its priesthood was necessarily less powerful, so its sacrificial system was less burdensome and less terrible. Human sacrifices were few.⁷ They sacrificed their llamas, small birds, rabbits, and

¹ Prescott, “Mexico,” c. iv. end.

² Prescott, “Peru,” c. iii. p. 51. “In cloudy weather they had recourse to the means of friction.” Réville, p. 196.

³ Max Müller, “Physical Religion,” pp. 286–9.

⁴ On this usage, see Mr. Frazer’s “Golden Bough,” c. iii. sec. 14–15.

⁵ Stevenson, “Twenty Years’ Residence in South America,” i. 401; ii. 70–3.

⁶ Prescott, “History of the Conquest of Peru,” B. i. c. 2, citing Garcilasso.

⁷ On this point, over which there has been dispute, see Prescott’s note, and Mr. Kirk’s note on that, in his edition, p. 51.

dogs; and while they alone of the American races had burnt-offerings,¹ they ate their unburnt sacrifices raw,² here giving another proof of the tendency of religion to preserve, wherever possible, the most ancient usages of all. Only occasionally, at certain feasts, were infants or children offered up; and this usage was being replaced by the practice of drawing blood without killing. When an Inca was ill, they were still prepared to sacrifice one of his sons to the Sun, praying that the child should be taken in substitution for the father, a usage which we know to have subsisted among the early Hebrews, as among the Carthaginians, and of which a clear trace remains in the legend of Abraham and Isaac. They had, in addition, the custom of Suttee, like the Hindus; good widows, especially those of the Incas, being at one time expected to bury themselves alive when their husbands died,³ so as to be wives to them in the spirit world; but this custom was dying out, being replaced by the symbolism of placing statuettes in a man's tomb to represent his wives and servants.⁴ And we may be sure that the lovers of the good old times protested bitterly against such an emancipation of women from their "proper sphere."

Here, then, was a civilization in which, alongside of a material progress equal to that of Mexico, there was but little of the atrocity of the Mexican religion, and a prospect of the entire disappearance of the horrible. And here, of course, the Christian champion steps in to show how much inferior Peruvian religion and morals were to those of Christianity. The Peruvians had the institution of a Holy Communion, in which they ate of a sacred bread, *sancu*, sprinkled with the blood of a sacrificed sheep, the priest pronouncing this formula:—"Take heed how ye eat this *sancu*; for he who eats it in sin, and with a double will and heart, is seen by our Father, the Sun, who will punish him with grievous troubles. But he who, with a single heart, partakes of it, to him the Sun and the Thunderer will show favour, and will grant children and happy years, and abundance of all that he requires." All then made a solemn vow of piety and loyalty before eating.⁵ And yet M. Réville, Doctor in Divinity, would have us believe that there was nothing essentially "moral" in such rites, because they had in view temporal well-being.⁶ So with the rites of infant baptism and confession of sins, which the Peruvians also practised: we are to conclude that "even where the Peruvian religion seems to undertake the

¹ Prescott, p. 44, citing McCulloch.

² Réville, p. 220.

³ In this usage we probably have the origin of the practice of burying alive the unfaithful "Virgins of the Sun" in Peru, and Vestals in Rome. Dr. Réville explains the practice in both cases by the idea of devoting to darkness the unfaithful spouse of the Sun (Lectures cited, p. 207). But the Roman Vestal was dedicated to the Goddess Vesta, who is identified with the *earth*, as hearth-fire and as female principle. To the same ancient practice of burying wives alive may be ascribed the long-retained practice of putting some female criminals to death in that fashion. Michelet (*Guerres de religion*, p. 87) gives the absurd explanation that burying alive was resorted to as being more decent than burning alive, because in the latter case the flames soon left the victim naked.

⁴ Still, it survived the Conquest. Prescott, p. 43, n, citing Ondegardo.

⁵ "Rites and Laws of the Incas," p. 27.

⁶ Lectures cited, pp. 227, 233-5.

elevation and protection of morals, it does so rather with a utilitarian and selfish view than with any real purpose of sanctifying the heart and will."¹ Well, I am obliged to say that this is the merest darkening of counsel by Christian prejudice. The Mexicans and Peruvians had just the same kind of moral feeling in any given stage of civilization as Christians have had in a similar culture stage; and when I contemplate the prevailing Evangelicalism of the moment in England, with its exhortation to men to believe in the blood of Jesus in order to escape hell-fire, I am at a loss to see which hemisphere has had the advantage. The Spaniards themselves recognised that the Mexicans ate the mystical body of the God with every sign of devotion and contrition.² They were so far from depreciating the Peruvian communion, that they supposed St. Bartholomew had established it.³ The Mexican wise-woman who prayed the merciful Goddess to cleanse the babe from the sin of its parents will compare perfectly well with the practisers of infant baptism among ourselves; and I cannot see that the Mexican and Peruvian confessors stood as a rule any lower morally than those of Christendom at the same culture-stage.⁴ The Mexican priests gave indulgences; but they never went to the lengths of the Renaissance Papacy in that direction. And if material well-being was looked to in these New World cults, why, what is the case in England, when the Salvation Army gives up salvation, and takes to industrialism; and when the national motto seems to be the apocryphal royal saying that "The Bible is the secret of England's greatness"?

The fact is, the promotion of material well-being is precisely what is oftenest claimed for Christianity; and the argument is, I suppose, only changed in the case of Peru and Mexico because there it would break down. For the great fact about these heathen civilizations is that they did attain material well-being in a very remarkable degree. I will not say with Dr. Draper that the Spaniards destroyed a higher civilization than their own—that is, their own in Europe; but at least it was in many ways superior to that which they have put in its place. What they have done is completely to destroy the civilizations they found, without replacing them at all, in large measure. In the matters of road-making, agriculture, and the administration of law, the new civilization is not to be compared with the old, which, indeed, was on these points ahead of anything in Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire. They had clean streets, and lighted streets, when Europe had not. Dr. Réville, indeed, lays undue stress on the lighting of the streets, which was not done by lamps, but by fires;⁵ but even that was an improvement on the European state of things of even two hundred years ago. Peru to-day is a desolation compared with what

¹ *Id.*, p. 233.

² Prescott, "Mexico," app., p. 641.

³ Prescott, "Peru," p. 52.

⁴ The casting of horoscopes for infants was practised in Europe just as in Mexico at the time of the Conquest.

⁵ Robertson, "History of America," B. vii. (Works, ed. 1821, ix. 22).

it was under the Incas : and under the new religion the native races seem to be positively lower than under the old. And on the side of morality and humanity, who shall say what the gain was in Mexico when the Christian conquerors, after execrating the practice of human sacrifice, set up their own Holy Inquisition to claim its victims for the propitiation of the three new Gods, harrying still further the people they had already decimated by atrocious tyranny and cruelty.

It is little to the purpose to urge, as was done by Joseph de Maistre,¹ that "the immense charity of the Catholic priesthood" sought to protect the natives in every way from the cruelty and avarice of the conquerors. It is in the nature of all priesthoods in close connexion with the people to seek or wish its good in some way ; the Mexican priests, as we have seen, enjoined beneficence, and they treated their own vassals well.² But when the Christian apologist declares that he has "no knowledge of a single act of violence laid to the charge of the priests," save in the one case of Valverde in Peru,³ he goes far indeed beyond his brief. There were certainly humane priests, as Las Casas and Sahagun ; but what but "acts of violence" were the whole efforts of the priesthood to destroy the ancient monuments and records, to say nothing of the operations of the Inquisition ? It is not, however, in mere "acts of violence" that the fatality of Christian junction with non-Christian civilization lies : it belongs to the nature of the case ; and religious principle, which encouraged the original act of conquest, is worse than powerless to avert the consequences. If higher or stronger races will not leave lower or weaker alone, they must do one of three things : exercise a mere supervision, good or bad, as Englishmen do in India, where they cannot breed ; or crowd the weaker out, as is being done in North America and Australia ; or strangle the lower civilization without developing the higher, as has been done in Mexico and Peru by Christians, and in Egypt by Saracens. What has never been done is for one civilization, with a developed religious system, to seize hold of an alien civilization with an alien religious system, and go on developing the first while changing the second.

It may, indeed, be charged against the Catholic Church that its unchangeable hostility to the spread of knowledge has been the means of paralysing progress in countries where, as in Mexico and Peru, it has been able to attain absolute dominion over minds and bodies. "It seems hard," says Dr. Tylor,⁴ "to be always attacking the Catholic clergy ; but of one thing we cannot remain in doubt—that their influence has had more to do than anything else with the doleful ignorance which reigns supreme in Mexico." But it is not Catholicism that is the explanation. "The only

¹ *Soirées de Saint Petersbourg*, ed. 1821, i. 109.

² Prescott, p. 34.

³ Even this he seeks to cast doubt upon. But even Valverde might intelligibly have sought to protect the Indians, as he is said to have done, after helping to massacre them in the conquest. They had become his tithe-payers.

⁴ "Anahuac," p. 126.

difference," avows Dr. Brinton,¹ "in the results of the two great divisions of the Christian world," in the matter of conquests, "seems to be that on Catholic missions has followed the debasement, on Protestant missions the destruction of the race." In fine, the claim that there is an inherent civilizing virtue in Christianity is here, as elsewhere, turned to confusion. "Christianity," as the same writer declares,² "has shown itself incapable of controlling its inevitable adjuncts; and it would have been better, morally and socially, for the American race never to have known Christianity at all than to have received it on the only terms on which it has been possible to offer it."

All that Christendom could possibly have done for the American civilizations would have been to leave them to their own development, like those of China and Japan, under the influence of superior example at certain points. Progress there might then conceivably have been.³ There is little use in speculating over the might-have-been; but at least we should not overlook the fact that in Peru there are distinct records of rationalism among the theocratic Incas themselves. Several of these remarkable rulers⁴ are recorded to have expressed the conviction that the Sun, for ever moving in his allotted course, could not be the Supreme Deity he was said to be—that there must be another Deity who ruled him.⁵ This reminds us that in all ages and under all religions there have been Free-thinkers; men who knew that the Gods were myths while the Vedic hymns were being made; Sadducees among the Jews; Mu'tazilites among the Mohammedans. For the history of mental evolution has not been that of a simple process from religion to rationalism, but of a constant war between the two tendencies in the human mind; and what has happened hitherto is just that inasmuch as the majority have thought little, they have been

¹ "American Hero Myths," p. 206.

² *Id.*, p. 207.

³ The Mexican language, in particular, shows great capabilities. "Of all the languages spoken on the American continent, the Aztec is the most perfect and finished, approaching in this respect the tongues of Europe and Asia, and actually surpassing many of them by its elegance and expression. Although wanting the six consonants, *b, d, f, r, g, s*, it may still be called full and rich. Of its copiousness, the "Natural History" of Dr. Hernandez gives evidence, in which are described twelve hundred different species of Mexican plants, two hundred or more species of birds, and a large number of quadrupeds, reptiles, insects, and metals, each of which is given its proper name in the Mexican language. Mendieta says that it is not excelled in beauty by the Latin, displaying even more art in its construction, and abounding in tropes and metaphors. Camargo calls it the richest of the whole land, and the purest, being mixed with no foreign barbaric element; Gomara says it is the best, most copious, and most extended in all New Spain; Davila Padilla, that it is very elegant and graceful, although it contains many metaphors which make it difficult; Loreozana, that it is very elegant, sweet, and complete; Clavigero, that it is copious, polite, and expressive; Brasseur de Bourbourg, that from the most sublime heights it descends to common things with a sonorousness and richness of expression peculiar to itself. The missionaries found it ample for their purpose, as in it, and without the aid of foreign words, they could express all the shades of their dogmas" (Bancroft, iii. 727-8).

⁴ According to Prescott, the crania of the Incas show great superiority to those of the people, which may well be believed; but the data are called in question. See Kirk's ed. p. 18.

⁵ Réville, pp. 162-5.

religious. To measure the position of any nation in this regard, you have for the most part simply to consider the status and multiplying power of its priesthood. And for us to-day there is one special lesson to be drawn from the case of these unbelieving Incas, who never modified their theocratic practice as regarded the multitude, whatever they might say among themselves. Their principle evidently was that the masses must be deluded. Well, we know that when the royal line fell, those masses were wholly unable to act for themselves, and fell abjectly under the sway of a mere handful of Conquerors. Unless your masses also rationalise, they will never attain a worthy humanity. So that, unless the Freethinkers are *more* righteous than the Scribes and Pharisees—the proverb is somewhat musty.

So engrossing is the survey of those two leading cults of Mexico and Peru, that we cannot well manage, in a single lecture, to go beyond them, though, as our title and our premisses imply, there were many other cults among the pre-Christian Americans. On the beliefs of the savages of both North and South America there is now a whole literature. We saw, too, that the American civilization first reached a notable stage in Central America and the Isthmus; and traces have been preserved of some of the cults which prevailed there. The summary given of some of them by Mr. Bancroft will serve to illustrate the old process by which the human mind reached the same essential results out of a superficial variety of materials :—

"The most prominent personage in the Isthmian Pantheon was Dabaiba, a goddess who controlled the thunder and lightning, and with their aid devastated the lands of those who displeased her. In South America, thunder and lightning were held to be the instruments used by the sun to inflict punishment upon its enemies, which makes it probable that Dabaiba was a transformed sun-goddess. Pilgrims resorted from afar to her temple at Urabá, bringing costly presents and human victims, who were first killed and then burned, that the savoury odours of roasting flesh might be grateful in the nostrils of the goddess. Some describe her as a native princess, whose reign was marked by great wisdom and many miracles, and who was apotheosized after death. She was also honoured as the mother of the Creator, the maker of the sun, the moon, and all invisible things, and the sender of blessings, who seems to have acted as mediator between the people and his mother, for their prayers for rain were addressed to him, although she is described as controlling the showers; and once, when her worship was neglected, she inflicted a severe drought upon the country. When the needs of the people were very urgent, the chiefs and priests remained in the temple, fasting and praying with uplifted hands; the people meanwhile observed a four-days' fast, lacerating their bodies and washing their faces, which were at other times covered with paint. So strict was this fast, that no meat or drink was to be touched until the fourth day, and then only a soup made from maize-flour. The Priests themselves were sworn to perpetual chastity and abstinence, and those who went astray in these matters were burned or stoned to death. Their temples were encompassed with walls, and kept scrupulously clean; golden trumpets, and bells with bone clappers, summoned the people to worship."¹

It is needless to repeat the process of comparison in this case. What must be clear to all is that the varying doctrines, whether of the Creator-Son interceding with the Divine Mother, or of the Divine Mother interceding

¹ Bancroft, iii. 498-9, citing Peter Martyr, dec. vii. lib. x.; Irving's "Columbus," iii. 173-4; Müller, "Amerikanische Urreligionen," p. 421.

with the Creator-Son, or of the Stern God who must be pacified by sacrifice, all alike represent the child-like guesses of ignorant humanity. Where one reaches a fairer ideal of conduct than the other, it is because humanity had reached the ideal, not because of any single person's attainment or revelation of it. The supernatural is but the ignorant distortion or the yearning transfiguration of the natural; and this holds good of morals as well as of dogmas, for men's morality, which would of itself tend to advance under favouring material and social conditions, may as easily be cramped as elevated by their religion, of which the nature is to remain stationary. And it is for us to-day to act on the perception that, whatever be our moral advances over the state of things under past faiths, it is not to dogma but to the general lift of civilization that we owe them; and that we shall never be on a really safer and higher platform than these bygone religionists until we reverse not only their practices but their methods.

POSTSCRIPT.

In regard to the question of the antiquity of man in America, raised at the outset of the foregoing lecture, it should be admitted that there is some staggering evidence (cited in Lyell's "Antiquity of Man") as to the existence of man in the Mississippi valley between fifty and sixty thousand years ago. I can only say that, pending an exact checking of the calculations of Lyell, which are open to revision, I should still adhere to the hypothesis of late emigration from Asia. There may, of course, have been very early immigration also. Fifty thousand years ago, "Man" must have been a somewhat different creature from the types known to us; and it would be well to have some check on Lyell's vague assertion that the "type" of cranium found in the fourth forest stratum at New Orleans was "that of the aboriginal American race."

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS
or
THE WORLD

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

By F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.,

Late Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxon.

THE Armenians are at the present day, with the exception, perhaps, of the Jews, the most widely dispersed of all races. Wave after wave of invasion has broken over their country, and carried sword and fire into their valleys, with the result that famine has driven them forth in groups of ten and a hundred families at a time to seek sustenance among better-governed communities. I am afraid, also, that some of their emigrations have been caused by their own internal religious dissensions. Thus, owing to the Paulician heresy in the eighth and ninth centuries, thousands of them were removed to Bulgaria, with results momentous for the religious history of Europe. Centuries afterwards, the invasion of Tamerlane drove new colonies of them to take refuge in Poland and Russia; and Shah Abbas, the despot of Persia, transported thousands of them to Joulfa, near Ispahan, at a later date. In the age of Queen Elizabeth we find the north of India overrun by their merchants. The old cemetery at Agra is full of their tombs, dating back to the reign of Akbar, and in the eighteenth century they built churches in Calcutta and Madras, and set up printing presses; and in the south of India, in the last century, they lived in the best houses, built roads and bridges, and appropriated to themselves the sacred places of the early Nestorian Christians. In the fourteenth century they had churches in China; and to-day the greatest number of their refugees is to be found in the Dutch East Indies. The largest contributions in support of the patriotic paper which, appearing in London and Paris, has done so much in the last few years to let in light upon the persecutions to which the race is subjected in the Turkish Empire, proceed from Java. In England, we have colonies of them in Manchester and London; in France, in Paris and Marseilles; in Russia, in Moscow and Rostof on the Don. Everywhere they are traders; and in cities like Tiflis and Constantinople, the greater part of the shops are kept by them.

The invasions which have devastated the country were invited by its geographical position. It has always been on the highway from East to West. It is an elevated plateau from three to five thousand feet above the

sea, bordered on the north partly by the Black Sea from Trebizond to Batoom, partly by the land of Georgia; on the south, its mountains sink insensibly into the great plains of Mesopotamia. On the east, it approaches nearly to the Caspian Sea; on the west, it is limited by Cappadocia and the mountains to the east of the river Halys. In this plateau three great rivers take their rise—the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Aras or Araxes. Of these the latter is the most eastern; and in its basin, bordered on the north by the great range of the Anti-Caucasus, and on the south by the range of Ararat, lay the ancient cities of Erivan, Artaxata, and Edschmiadzin, the centres of the old Armenian religion and civilization. South of the Ararat range there is the vast lake of Van, on whose south-east shore, as we know from the cuneiform inscriptions found there, was once a great political centre. On the southern edge of Armenia lay the Syrian cities of Edessa and Samosata, fertile in ancient times of religious heresies and orthodoxies.

Who the primitive inhabitants of this region really were, it is difficult to ascertain. Following the Biblical legend, the Armenians believe that it was the original home of the human race; and they still pretend that on the summit of Mount Ararat, overhanging their convent of Edschmiadzin, there lingers the ark of Noah. However, they will admit that this mountain has only borne the name of Ararat in recent times, and that its ancient name was Masis. The lonely majesty of this vast snowy summit, rising out of sunburnt plains, and limiting the horizon for hundreds of miles from whichever side you approach it, may well have given rise to the supposition that it is the mountain upon which the Ark rested. An American missionary, Mr. Eli Smith, who explored Armenia in the year 1828, has a passage of touching simplicity on this point. He says, "Two objections are made to the supposition that Scripture refers to this mountain, when it speaks of the mountains of Ararat. One is, that there are now no olive-trees in its vicinity, from which Noah's dove could have plucked the leaf. And it is true; so far as we can learn, that that tree exists neither in the valley of the Koor, nor of the Aras, nor anywhere nearer than Batoom, a distance of seven days' journey. But might not a dove make this journey in a day? or might not the climate have been warmer then than it is now?" The Armenians believe not only that this is the mountain on which the Ark rested after the flood, but that the ark still exists on the top; though rather from supernatural than from physical obstacles no one has yet been able to visit it. "A devout Vartabed once tried to ascend the mountain. While yet far from the top drowsiness came upon him, and he awoke at the bottom in the very spot whence he had started. Another attempt resulted only in the same miraculous failure, whereupon he betook himself more fervently to prayer, and started the third time. Again he slept and awoke at the bottom. But now an angel stood before him with a fragment of the ark, as a token that his pious purpose was approved and his prayer answered, though he could never be allowed to reach the summit

of the mountain. The precious gift was thankfully received, and is to this day carefully preserved as a sacred relic in the convent." (Mr. Eli Smith's narrative.)

But putting aside legends, it is probable that a race akin to the modern Georgians inhabited the whole of this country ; and it has been contended that the cuneiforms found at Armavir, in the basin of the Araxes, and at Van, are in a dialect akin to ancient Georgian, which became a literary language at the same time with Armenian in the fourth century A.D. These inscriptions show, in any case, that in these far-off centuries, eight hundred to one thousand B.C., the Assyrian influence was paramount in these regions, and that they were not yet settled by an Indo-European race. And this agrees with the traditions which ancient writers have preserved to us with respect to the Armenian race. Thus Herodotus assures us that the Armenians were colonists of the Phrygiads, and Strabo tells us that they were of the same race with the Thessalians of the Balkan Peninsula. Their language attests that they are of an Indo-European stock, and not of a Semitic ; although there are many Semitic roots and elements ingrained in their language. The only objection to the supposition that they came into Asia Minor by way of the Bosphorus, and advanced eastwards, instead of coming along with the Iranic or Persian race from the East, is this, that their language is interpenetrated with very old Persian words, and that the old Persian fire-worship and adoration of the goddess Anahita was thoroughly established among them. But since the philologist assures us that the Armenian language is distinct from any Iranic dialect, we must suppose that these Persian words, so frequent in the Armenian dictionary, were borrowed. They are, as a rule, terms relating to war and architecture and government. As late as the middle ages the word "*daric*" was a common term for any kind of money among them, and the word "*matean*," which means book, may be a reminiscence of the Medians, whose country was known anciently as that of the Matieni. It will be remembered that the Magians, from whom the Persians derived their religious books and ceremonies, were a Median tribe ; and perhaps because their first books came from the same people, the Armenians called them Matean ; but this is doubtful, for they called the Medes *Mark*.

Until the first century before Christ Armenia was dependent on the State which happened to have the chief power in the regions which lie between the Black Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean, and the Caspian. I have remarked that surviving monuments attest the early political dependence of Armenia upon Assyria. Later on, in the fifth century we read that the Armenians served in the army of the great king against the Greeks. In later centuries they became a client State of the Parthian Empire, and their country was a recognised patrimony of the eldest son of the Parthian monarch. It is not till about ninety years B.C. that Armenia achieved any independent political splendour and extension of its own. At that date King Mithridates of Pontus aspired to found an

Empire in Asia Minor which should unite all the scattered fragments of Alexander's conquests, and blend Hellenic culture with Persian religion and political capacity. Tigranes, his relative and king of Armenia, joined with him in these aspirations, and, as a first step to their fulfilment, took Cappadocia, overthrew the last of the Seleukids, and extended the Armenian kingdom as far west as Cilicia and the Mediterranean. But the joint projects of these two monarchs were wrecked upon the growing power of Rome. Lucullus and Pompey the Great, at the head of their legions, invaded Armenia, and penetrated as far even as their capital, Artaxata in the basin on the Araxes. For the next three hundred years Armenia remained, as Mommsen says, a sally port between the two great rival civilized powers of the earth, Parthia and Rome; just as in subsequent ages it was ever disputed ground between the Roman Emperors of Constantinople and the Persian kings or Mahometan khaliphs. It was frequently, and for long periods, a Roman client State; the Romans would bring a young Armenian prince to Rome and educate him, then establish him with the help of their legions on the Armenian throne. As soon as their backs were turned, their puppet would be overthrown by the Nationalist party in Armenia, and then the whole process of conquest would begin over again. Afghanistan, lying between the Russian and English empires, has, and, it is to be feared, may yet again play a similar part in the politics of the distant East.

In religion, and in ecclesiastical matters generally, Armenia held, after her conversion to Christianity, the same position which she had thus for centuries held politically. She joined herself neither with the Greek nor with the Syrian Church, just as to-day she joins herself neither with the Russian nor the Roman Church. The Armenians have always held aloof and kept their independence by balancing against one another the claims of those religious organizations which happen to come nearest to her and to be most powerful. Christianity seems to have come into their country from Syria and from Greek Cappadocia both at once. That they owed their Christianity in part to the Syrians was remembered at a later day, and is the germ of truth underlying the legend of King Abgar. The legend ran, that this king, who ruled at Edessa, sent a complimentary letter to Jesus Christ in Jerusalem, by the hand of an artist who was to make a picture of the Redeemer and take it back with him to Edessa. Jesus did not grant the favour exactly in the way requested, but holding a cloth before His face gave it to the messenger to take with him. When King Abgar opened it, he found miraculously impressed thereon an image of the features of Christ. That this is a late legend is clear from this, that until the beginning of the fourth century, and even later, there was the strongest dislike among Christians of any image, pictorial or statuesque, of Christ; and we have a long letter of Eusebius to the sister of Constantine the Great expressly condemning anything of the sort.

In the days of Diocletian and earlier, a Roman garrison was stationed

at Artaxata and at Valarshapat, and it is very likely that Christianity first crept in through Christian soldiers stationed in these Imperial camps. In the same way Roman soldiers brought perhaps the earliest Christianity into England. The Armenian legends connect Christianity in Armenia with Diocletian and with Rome. In the year 260 A.D. it is related that Tiridates ascended the Armenian throne. His father Chosroes had been murdered by one Anak, himself of Royal blood, and father of the future great Missionary Gregory, called the Illuminator, because through him the Armenians were converted to Christianity. In the confusion which followed the murder of Chosroes Gregory was taken as a young child to Cæsarea, a Greek City of Cappadocia, and brought up as a Christian by a lady who took pity upon him. As a man, he returned to his native country, determined to convert it to Christianity. His kinsman Tiridates threw him straightway into a well, where he lay for many years. At this point two ladies from Rome appear on the scene. Gaiana was an abbess at Rome with one of whose young nuns, Rhipsima, Diocletian had fallen in love. To avoid him, Rhipsima flees all the way to Valarshapat, or New City, as it was then called in Roman official language. Diocletian forthwith orders a search to be made all over the empire, in prosecuting which his vassal, the King Tiridates, discovers Rhipsima in his own territory and wants to marry her himself. She, having taken vows, resists, is backed up by Gaiana, and they are both martyred for their obstinacy. The divine Nemesis then falls upon Tiridates, who goes mad like Nebuchadnezzar, roams about the fields, and is eventually turned into a black hog. Then the king's sister has a dream. It is revealed to her that the Apostle Gregory must be fetched up out of his well. He is accordingly rescued from the scorpions and toads among which he had lived for fourteen years, fed miraculously all the time by an angel; he collects the fragments of the bodies of Rhipsima and Gaiana, buries them and builds churches over them. Tiridates regains his human form and reason, and Gregory has a vision in which he beholds the heavens open and the only-born Son of God descend where the present church of Edschmiadzin is built. That word is an Armenian sentence, and means, "The only born came down." Close by you are shown at the present day the churches of the first martyrs, Rhipsima and Gaiana. At some distance you are also shown, close under Mount Ararat, the well in which St. Gregory was confined. It is a circular pit, walled with stone and covered with a dome, and is a very sacred spot and much frequented by pilgrims. St. Gregory, in the Armenian imagination, ranks as high as any of the apostles, and his dead hand, a shrivelled black object, is still preserved in the Cathedral Church, and is used to ordain each succeeding Catholicos. But this is anticipating. After the vision of Gregory, Tiridates becomes a Christian, and by force or persuasion converts 200,000 of his subjects. He then despatches Gregory to Cæsarea to be ordained by Leontius, the Greek Bishop of Cappadocia. There he was ordained as the Catholicos of Armenia. This

title simply meant that he presided over the whole region of Armenia and was equivalent to the Latin dignity of Bishop *in partibus infidelium*. It was a less honourable position than that of Patriarch at that time; and it was only when the Armenians definitely separated themselves from the Greeks that the title of Catholicos acquired the meaning of Primate of Armenia.

The privileges of a Catholicos were thus in the fourth century inferior to those of a Patriarch. But with the gradual separation of the Armenians from the Greek Orthodox Church during the two following centuries, its head, who had been at first a mere deputy of the Bishop of Cæarea, acquired privileges similar to those which the Pope of Rome enjoys to-day. Since the fifth century, the Catholicos alone has had the right to ordain Bishops and to consecrate the holy oil used in the sacraments of confirmation, ordination, and extreme unction. He even institutes and gives spiritual authority to the Patriarchs who preside over the Armenians in Constantinople and in Jerusalem. Thus we have to-day a complete inversion of the fourth-century practice.

The Armenians not only converted themselves to Christianity, but tried to persuade the rude and fierce nations who surrounded them to adopt the same faith. It is probable, though not certain, that the Georgians and the Albanians who inhabited all the southern slopes of the Caucasus range derived their Christianity from the Armenians; and we have in a contemporary historian a touching relation of an attempt which was made by a son of the Illuminator Gregory of the same name to bring over the Huns to Christianity. There was, we read, a connection by marriage between the king of the Huns and the Armenian Royal family, relying on which the young Gregory presented himself before the king of the Massagetæ, who commanded the immense army of the Huns. Standing up before them he began to preach the gospel of Christ and bid them acknowledge the true God. At first the Huns listened attentively, accepted his teaching, and submitted themselves to him. But afterwards, when they came to examine the religion of Christ, they learned that God detests pillage, murder, avarice, and the wish to get hold of that which belongs to other people. When they learned that, they said, "If we leave off pillaging and despoiling other people, and cease to rob them of their goods, how shall we keep up so numerous an army as ours." Then in very persuasive language Gregory tried to convince them, but no one would listen to him any more. They said among themselves, Here is one come among us who with such harangues as these tries to prevent our doing what we have always done till now. If we listen to him and become Christians, what will become of us? we shall hardly be able to live on horseback as before. And they added that it was a scheme of the Armenian king "who has sent preachers to us in order to propagate this doctrine among us and make us cease from our incursions into his kingdom. Come, let us kill him and begin our invasions afresh, and enrich our

country with plenty of booty." Then the king of the Massagetæ placed himself at the head of his troops. They brought a wild horse and tied the young Gregory to its tail, and lashing it sent it galloping along the shore of the Great Northern Sea,—the Caspian,—which extended beyond their camp, which lay in the plain of Vadrnian. It was thus they slew the goodly preacher of Christ, the young Gregory. But those who were his companions took back his body into the country of the Albanians on the borders of Armenia, and buried it near the church which had been built by the first Gregory, surnamed the Great, who was the grandfather of Gregory. And every year the inhabitants of all the Cantons meet together to celebrate his memory and the day of his martyrdom. (Faustus of Buzant.)

In Armenia Christianity had to contend with the old religion of the people, which did not yield without a struggle. We learn from Strabo that the sacred institutions of the Persians were shared by the Medes and Armenians. "The latter pay special honour to the worship of the goddess Anaitis, temples to whom they have built in sundry places, but especially in Akilisene, where they offer up human sacrifices of male and female slaves. And in honour of the same goddess the Armenian maidens, even the noblest, are wont to prostitute themselves, following the example of the Lydian girls in the days of Herodotus." We know from Pliny how strict in their religion the Princes of Armenia were in the first century, when one of them, whom Nero had invited to come to Rome, refused on the score that to cross the sea would be to pollute it. Even after the conversion to Christianity of the Armenians there are indications that the old religion lingered on in out-of-the-way places. Thus in the twelfth century we hear of people in the south of Armenia who worshipped the sun and revered particular trees, especially the poplar. The Armenians, when they pray, always turn to the sun, whatever its position in the heavens. For the first 400 years after their conversion the priesthood was hereditary among them, just as it had been hereditary among the Magi before their conversion. In the fourth century the primacy of the Armenian Church passed from Gregory the Illuminator to his sons and grandsons. In the eighth century it was necessary to draw up regulations for the Armenian Church, ordaining that any one might be ordained priest who was spiritually competent, and that candidates need not be drawn thenceforth exclusively from priestly families. Lastly, it is interesting to notice, that the custom of sacrificing animals lingered on to a much later day. A large part of the income of an Armenian priest in the days anterior to their conversion was derived from the sacrifices of animals brought to the temple by the people. At the time of their conversion these sacrifices were not discontinued, but only christianized. Thus the Armenians even to-day, when they kill an animal for food, are said to turn its head towards the east and make a cross over it in the name of the Trinity.¹ The Muhammadan practice is similar. They also

¹ Eli Smith's Narrative of Missionary Research in Armenia.

kill an animal for food in the name of God the Most Merciful, and it would have been well if in that name they had only cut the throats of animals and not of men also. In the eighth century canons were made for the Armenian Church forbidding animals to be actually slaughtered in the church, but allowing the priests to accept their tit-bits and portions as before.

It is perhaps more than a coincidence, that in the last decades of the third century, when Christianity was beginning to spread over Asia, there was a revival also of the old Persian or Magic religion. With the advent of a Sassanide dynasty in Persia this revival took place; and there forthwith ensued a death struggle between the fire-worship and the Christian religion, from the Persian Gulf up to the very sources of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates. In Armenia, after a stubborn struggle, Christianity prevailed; but in Persia Magism got the upper hand. The custom of exposing the dead to be devoured by birds now came to be enforced upon every one, whereas it had hitherto been confined to the magi or priest caste. At the same time the cumbrous ceremonial of priestly purification was enforced upon the whole people. But it was too great a burden to bear. And it was not many centuries before the Persians themselves sought refuge from the righteousness of the Magi in Muhammadanism, a religion at once simpler and more elevated in its conceptions of things divine. The mild theism of the Parsees of Bombay is the only form in which the Magism of the Sassanide epoch to-day survives.

Elisæus the teacher, an Armenian writer whose style is not unworthy of the great events which he relates, has preserved for us many moving pictures of the fierce persecutions of Armenian Christians which were instigated by the Magi in the fifth century.

These Persian persecutions were, like those inflicted by Rome, as much political as religious, and were designed to detach the Armenians from the Greek alliance. In the person of Constantine, Christianity for the first time in history sat on the throne of the Cæsars and became the official religion of the Empire. Hence the Persian National party, who had triumphed in the accession to the throne of the Sassanides, regarded Christianity as Greek in its sympathies, and determined to put it down. Thus we read of edicts issued by the Persian kings forbidding to the Armenians the use of Greek books. But Christianity was really far from Hellenizing the Armenians; on the contrary, it was the occasion of their founding a vernacular literature written in an alphabet of their own. Armenian literature begins with their conversion to Christianity. Under Gregory and his immediate successors they seem to have translated chiefly from Syriac books; but during the fifth century they translated Greek books. Scholars were sent abroad, to Athens and Antioch and Alexandria, to collect the leading works of Greek divines and translate them into Armenian, and these works survive as models of style and purity of diction to the present day. It is only to be regretted that they translated exclusively those writers, like Chrysostom

and the Basils, who were in vogue in the fifth century, to the neglect of the great writers and thinkers of previous generations. We could well spare a translation even of Chrysostom, if we had instead versions of Clement and Origen. Naturally, however, they chose the fashionable preachers of the day. It is more lamentable that they should have translated great writers like Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia, but have afterwards destroyed them, because they were heretical. I fear that the Armenians had not the virtue of tolerance in the fourth and fifth any more than in succeeding centuries. Thus we read that Mesrop undertook to beat down the bold and insolent sect of the "muddy ones," that is, of the Nestorians, who were preaching their tenets in Armenia. These poor heretics were given over to the most terrible tortures. "When" adds Mesrop's biographer, "in spite of torment and imprisonment, these men, hated of God, refused to walk in the way of salvation, they were burnt alive or chased with ignominy from the country." This was in the fifth century, when the Persian persecution was raging. It is evident that the uses of adversity were lost upon the Armenians of that day.

The invention of the Armenian alphabet marks a new epoch in the life of the Armenian people. It came of the want of a special character which would render all the sounds of their language, as the Greek and Syriac alphabets failed to do. The Bible and the liturgical books of the Greeks and Assyrians were the first to be translated, and written out in the Armenian character, and these versions really created the literary language of Armenia, in which were written forthwith a great number of historical and theological works. This literary outburst may be compared to that which took place in the sixteenth century in Germany, when Luther, by translating the Bible into German, created literary German language such as it is until to-day. In the same way Armenian literature, once created, kept alive the National spirit and became its guardian and vehicle, preserving its life against the alien conquerors who overran their land, but found themselves unable to impose their language or their religious books. In converting Armenia to Christianity, Gregory the Illuminator had but added one to the many pretexts of war which the neighbours of Armenia had against her; but the discovery, or rather invention by Mesrop of a peculiar alphabet prevented the national spirit from being lost, and entrenched it for ever in an impregnable fortress.¹

But the Christian religion, even if it purified manners and religious conceptions for the Armenians, and gave them a literature which has ever since been the safe-guard and vehicle of the expression of their national spirit, brought also political ruin upon them. More than before, the Armenian kings became the creatures alternately of Greek and Persian despots. Horde after horde of Huns and other barbarians overran their land, burned their cities, and pillaged their churches; and the Armenians paid tribute first to one and then to another conqueror, often to two at

¹ Cp. Geyterias "*Arménie et les Arméniens.*"

once. But amid these convulsions, while the old kingship disappears, a new power for the people to look to and gather round emerges, namely the Patriarchy. The discredit into which royal power sank more and more, owing to the incapacity and debauchery of the princes, intensified the national respect for the office of Patriarch. This office had always remained in the family of St. Gregory as long as there were any members surviving of that family; and the men who held that office were careful, while spreading Christianity, to gather into their own hands the moral authority which the Kingship was day by day losing. Consequently, when Armenia as a political State fell to pieces, it was around the Patriarch that the population rallied, for the national religion remained the only bond which could unite districts of their country separated from one another by long distances, by clashing interests, and often governed by different masters.¹

This explains why the Armenians have been so prone to identify their race with their religion, to deny the virtue of patriotism to all who have left on conscientious grounds the old Church of Gregory the Illuminator, and attached themselves either to the Roman Catholics or to Protestant sects. The complaint is always the same, that missions, whether of the Pope or of the American Protestants, denationalize the Armenians. I do not believe myself that the complaint is well-grounded, or that the Armenians who have joined other confessions are in any way behindhand in their aspirations for the future welfare of the race.

In the Eastern Church much activity was wasted in the fourth and fifth centuries in defining dogmatically the metaphysical relationship of the Second to the First Person of the Trinity; and although the Greek tongue failed to spread in Armenia, yet these baneful speculations excited interest there, and occasioned much heart-burning and persecution. The Armenians sent a son of Gregory named Aristaces to take part in the great council of Nice, in the year 325, when the opinions of Arius were in dispute. They attended the Council of Constantinople in 381 and of Ephesus in 431, and these three Councils they recognised. The issue at Ephesus in 431 was, whether Nestorius kept properly distinct the two natures in Christ, which, according to the Orthodox view, it was important not to confuse. Nestorius held that in Christ the Divine swallows up and absorbs the human character. The Orthodox admitted that Christ was without sin; but Nestorius went further, and in holding that Christ's body was freed from the limitations of time and space, was incomprehensible and not to be delineated or in any way imaged, fell into the damnable error of Monophysitism. It was Nestorius who led one side in the stormy Council at Ephesus; and St. Cyril of Alexandria, the coarse and brutal murderer of Hypatia, led the other side. Needless to say, it was his view which triumphed. But this Council was the occasion of the separation from the Greek of that Nestorian Church whose missionaries carried Christi-

¹ I borrow these remarks from Geyterias.

anity into Siberia and into China by land, and into the south of India by sea. In Armenia, as I have already mentioned, Nestorius had his following, which was however crushed out by the persecuting spirit of the Armenians themselves. But the turn of the Armenians came before long. They too were to become heretics in the year 451 A.D., when the Fourth general Council of the Church was held at Chalcedon, and Eutyches was condemned for what seems to us now-a-days a microscopic error. It appears that the Armenians, although they afterwards agreed with the controversial results arrived at in this Council, were not well represented at it, and were deceived by news brought to them, that in the Council of Chalcedon the Greeks had relapsed into the Nestorian errors condemned in 431 at Ephesus. The Armenian Patriarch accordingly convened a Council in the year 491 at Valarshapat, and anathematized the Council of Chalcedon. Subsequently they discovered their mistake, and to-day they anathematize Eutyches no less than do the Greeks. But *amour propre* has prevented them from ever joining again with the Greek Orthodox Church. Even under Basil, in the fourth century, we hear that there were quarrels at Cæsarea between the Greek and Armenian students of theology. The feeling of dislike steadily grew; and the establishment of a separate Armenian era in the year 551 marks the final rupture of the Armenian with the Greek Church.

At this point, therefore, we may fitly summarize the peculiarities which mark off the Armenian from other Churches; and I must assume that my




Fig. 1.

GROUND PLAN OF ARMENIAN CHURCH AT
GOPTCHA VANK NEAR ALEXANDRAPOL.




Fig. 2.

VIEW OF NORTH SIDE OF BITTO.

hearers are familiar with the main outlines of the Christian system, as presented by the Greek, or Latin, or English Church. Firstly, as to the plan of the fabric. An Armenian church is usually an oblong building¹ which assumes internally a cruciform shape by reason of there being in each corner an oblong or square cell, of which the walls are carried up to the roof, so that it only communicates with the general interior through a low arched door. The general interior is thus divided into four arms roofed by four gables; but over the middle of the building, where the gables converge, is a round or polygonal tower, admitting light to the church through its windows, and surmounted by a flattened form of steeple. Dr. Neale's description of the general type of a Byzantine church, "as a gabled Greek cross, with central dome, inscribed in a square or quasi-square," suits an Armenian or Georgian church equally well. Entering the western gate of the church, one stands in what was called the *narthex*, or part of the building reserved for penitents and catechumens, and one is flanked on either hand by the walled-up cells already mentioned. The *narthex* is usually separated from the space under the dome by a railing, which is often carried also along the inner edges of the transepts, so as to mark off the space under the tower, which answers to our nave and chancel both at once. Advancing a few steps, one finds oneself under the tower or dome, with a north and south transept on the left and right hands. These transepts are very stunted in length, and would hardly be recognised for transepts, as they do not project externally beyond the fabric, and in this respect differ from the transepts of an European church. Standing and looking eastward, one is faced by an apsidal recess opening between the two corner cells already mentioned. The floor of this recess is railed off, raised by steps from the rest of the church, and in the middle of it stands the altar. There is an arrangement for drawing a curtain across the front of the recess, so as to screen the altar from the congregation. This apsidal recess is in Armenia called the *bēm*, from the Greek word *bēma*, which in old days meant the pulpit from which the orator addressed the Greek *ecclesia*, or parliament. The Armenian word for church, "egheghetzi," is itself a corruption of the word *ecclesia*. The corner cell to the left of the *bēm* is in a Greek church called the *prothesis*, or place of exposing the bread and wine to be consecrated for the Communion. The cell on the right is in Greek called the *diaconicon*, or chamber for the deacons. In a Greek church they both open directly into the *bēma*, but in an Armenian church into the transepts only, so that the priest and deacon, when they are going to celebrate the Communion, must bring the bread down out of the *prothesis* into the transept, round the massive column which rises to left of the *bēma* and helps to support the tower, and then up the steps of the *bēma*, before it can be laid on the altar. On this altar lies a copy of the gospels, usually a manuscript, and often very ancient. The altar, or sacred table, stands in the middle of the *bēma*, so that the priests and deacons can walk round it, which they often do, the

¹ See Woodcuts.

while censing it and the sacred book and host which repose on it, with fragrant incense. The curtain drawn across the *bēma*,—sanctuary, or Holy of Holies,—answers to the altar rails in an English church. In a Greek church a regular wall with folding doors, called, from the pictures or icons which decorate it, the *iconostasis*, takes the place of the Armenian curtain. In a Latin church the side cells I have mentioned would be side chapels, but in an Armenian church there is, as a rule, but one altar, though, unlike the Greek, their religion allows of more than one. The *ambon*, or pulpit from which the prophecy, epistle and gospel, is read, is in the nave, to one side or other of the *bēma*, or centrally placed under the dome. Sermons also are preached from it, but do not form so integral and customary a part of the religious service as with us. The women are separated from the men, and keep themselves behind a railing in the narthex, or up in galleries if there be any. In Tiflis, however, and Calcutta, and in large towns generally, where they are not kept out of the way as in Turkey, they often stand or sit miscellaneously along with the men. In India, there are seats in Armenian churches as in English, but in Armenia never. All alike stand, or, if fatigued, squat on the floor. The walls are sometimes covered with sacred pictures, and, as in the Greek Church, images are forbidden. Before each picture burn candles and lamps; and most private devotion consists, as in Greece and Russia, in swaying oneself to and fro in prayer, with frequent prostrations on the pavement before these holy pictures. From an almost forgotten work (Smith and Dwight, "Missionary Research in Armenia"), I quote the following description of the celebration of High Mass in the church of the monastery of Edschmiadzin. As having myself witnessed the function, I can vouch that their account is just, while at the same time it is unprejudiced by that lack of sympathy with the doctrine and arrangements of an Eastern church, which disfigures much of their book, and shows that they had not left their Methodism behind them in America.

"The dressing of the officiating bishop was the first important part of the Mass, and a distinct prayer or meditation is said for every article of dress put on. But the ceremony being private, we witnessed only the chanting, which was performed at the same time in the church. He then entered in a splendid flowing mantle of heavy gold cloth, with a broad upright collar stiff with gold, and a mitre of the same rich materials, ornamented in front and behind with a sun of brilliants set in gold. Having washed his hands before all, read a summary confession of his sins, and received absolution pronounced by an assistant, he retired again to the sacristy to prepare the wine and the bread for consecration. A little wine, not mixed with water as in the Latin Church, is poured into a chalice; a thin cake of bread, not leavened as in the Greek Church, and stamped with various sacred symbols and letters, is placed on a small silver plate nicely fitted to the top of the cup. Each part of the ceremony has its appropriate prayer with the burning of incense; but a curtain drawn before

the sacristy veiled the whole from our view. The time taken up was long, and during it the congregation were entertained by nothing but the monotonous chanting of a large company of deacons and clerks.

"At length the Bishop, leaving the elements behind, came forward with a pompous procession and the burning of incense, and proceeded in a circuitous course through the congregation to the great altar. After a series of prayers, a deacon read the lesson of the day from the gospel and the Nicene Creed; and then, with the whole body of assistants, went for the elements. They were brought carefully veiled, accompanied by several pictures, and followed by a procession. The Bishop, whose mitre had in the meantime been removed by an assistant, took them and prayed: 'Accept this offering from us, and perfect it for the mystery of the body and blood of Thine only-begotten Son; grant that this bread and this cup may be a means of the remission of sin to those who taste.' The congregation being in the meantime exhorted to salute and kiss each other for the appearance of Christ, a deacon, taking the salutation from the Bishop, went and saluted the Catholics, and from him the ceremony passed through the whole congregation, each one bowing this way and that over the other's shoulder, as if to kiss him.

"The consecration followed. In performing this, the Bishop *blessed* the bread by making over it the sign of the cross, gave *thanks* by looking upward, *broke* it by picking out a crumb, and repeated the transubstantiating words, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' lifting it at the same time above his head for the congregation to worship, instead of giving it to them to eat. The ceremony for the wine was similar. The whole was performed privately, with the back of the officiator towards the congregation, and not a word or sign intended for them to hear or see, except the elevation of the elements. Prayers for the efficacy of the Mass to be applied to the communicants, to all believers, whether living or dead, and especially to any for whom a particular remembrance had been requested, followed. Then the Bishop, having first dipped the bread in the wine, took it between the thumb and forefinger of each hand, and holding the cup also between the palms of his hands turned to the congregation and cried, 'Holy, holy, let us with holiness taste of the honoured body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which, descending from heaven, is divided among us. This is life, hope, resurrection, propitiation, and remission of sins.' Turning, he replaced the elements on the altar, and a splendid curtain, large enough to veil the whole front of the sanctuary, being drawn, prevented us from witnessing what followed, except the chanting of the assistants in a semicircle before the altar. But according to the Canon, he had first to break the bread into four parts, and kiss it with weeping; and then, after sundry prayers and supplications, to eat the bread and drink the wine with fear and trembling, saying, 'May Thy incorruptible body be life unto me and Thy holy blood a propitiation and remission of sins.' The curtain being then withdrawn, a deacon cried, 'Approach with fear and faith, and with holi-

ness commune'; and as the Bishop turned round with the elements, the clerks on the part of the people cried, 'Our God and our Lord has appeared unto us; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' Eight or ten women came forward and communed; and bits of unconsecrated bread were distributed, as is customary also in the Greek Church, among the rest of the congregation, as they dispersed."

The Armenian Liturgy is immediately derived from the Greek Liturgy of Cæsarea; Saint Gregory the Illuminator, as we saw, was educated at Cæsarea, and returned thither for episcopal ordination at the hands of the Greek bishop, Leontius. The Cæsarean Liturgy immediately descended from the Greek Liturgy of St. James, which was in the main older, according to Dr. Neale, than A.D. 200. From the Greek Liturgy of St. James flowed also, but along another line of descent, the Syriac Liturgy of St. James, the archetype of the prayers offered up by Christians all over Syria and Mesopotamia. From the Greek Liturgy of Cæsarea flowed beside the Armenian,—in part, at least,—that of St. Chrysostom, which in the use of the Orthodox Greek Church has supplanted all other forms of divine service.

The Armenians are by the Greek and Latin Churches esteemed heretics, because they do not clearly distinguish in their Credo between the Divine and the human natures of Christ. The following is the clause of their creed: "We believe that one of the three Persons, God the Word, was begotten of His Father before all worlds: that in time He descended into the mother of God, the Virgin Mary; that He took from her blood and united it with His Godhead; that He abode nine months in the womb of the most pure Virgin; and that He was perfect God and perfect man, in spirit, in intellect, and in body: one person, one aspect, and united by one nature." These admissions that the Virgin's human blood was mixed with the Godhead, and that all Christ's faculties were conjoined in a single nature, and the further article that Christ's body, conjoined with His Godhead, lay in the grave, constitute the heresy of Monophysitism. So great an authority, however, upon what constitutes orthodoxy, as the late Dr. Neale, considers that though the words quoted are suspicious, yet the Armenians did not mean to express an heretical thought. He is therefore ready to admit them within the pale of orthodoxy.

The Armenians, like the Greeks and Latins, have seven sacraments. Baptism involves true immersion of the child, and is immediately followed by Confirmation (or anointing all over by the priest with chrism, or holy oil blessed by the bishop) and also by,—what is strange to us, though general in the Eastern Churches,—the administration of the Eucharist. The priest administers it by dipping his finger in the chalice wherein the bread has been steeped in the wine, moistening therewith the child's lips. Protestants commonly attribute a mystical value to Baptism, and believe that an unbaptized child goes direct to hell. If Baptism really be,—what it is according to this view,—an *opus operatum*, efficacious towards the individual's

salvation without any accompanying conscious spiritual change on his part, why should not the chrism and consecrated elements have a similar efficacy? Herein the Eastern Churches are only logical; and the Protestants in this, as in many other points in which they differ from the Christianity of the earlier centuries, strain at a gnat after swallowing the camel. With the chrism are believed to descend on the child the seven-fold gifts of the Spirit; and in Armenia a mere priest is instrumental to it, whereas in the English Church only a bishop, though he is so, not by anointing with oil, but by mere laying of his hands on the young person's head.

The Eucharist is, among the Armenians, given to the laity in both kinds, as in the English Church. In the Latin, as you know, sacerdotal pretension withholds it in one kind from laymen. The Armenians use pure wine, without water, and steep the bread in it, using unleavened bread, where we in England use ordinary bread. The words of institution "Take, eat," etc., along with an accompanying invocation to the Holy Spirit, are believed to transubstantiate the elements. Penitence is another sacrament; and auricular confession, according to an anciently prescribed form and catalogue of offences, is in vogue. Fasting is general and rigorous among Armenians as among Greeks, not even eggs, butter, milk, or cheese being allowed during the frequent and lengthy fasts. Ordination of priests, Marriage, and Extreme Unction are the remaining sacraments, which are administered much as in the Greek Communion.

The Armenian doctrine as to the last judgment is based on John v. 28-29 and Matt. xxv. 46. They pray for the dead, that their sins may be remitted, but have no purgatory or system of indulgences.

The hierarchy consists of bishop, priest, and deacon. Bishops are either archbishops, bishops, archimandrites, or vartabeds, *i.e.*, doctors. The priests who are ordained for cures of souls must be married when ordained, but may not marry a second time. They dress in white, and cannot become vartabeds or bishops. The higher clergy—bishops, vartabeds, archimandrites, etc.—dress in black, with huge peaked cowls, and are under vows of celibacy. They live chiefly in monasteries. The order of vartabeds—teachers—is noticeable. They enjoy the episcopal prerogatives of approving of articles of faith, of preaching in church (the ordinary clergy cannot preach in the East—only bishops do so), of judging and deciding suits and disputes. They are often more learned than the bishops, who are so left nothing to do but to confer holy orders. Galanus, a Vatican missionary in Armenia of the early seventeenth century, remarks, that for the lay Armenian mind the Vartabed represented the person of Christ, who was called Rabbi, or Master. He admits that they had done more than any other class to keep alive Christian faith and learning among the victims of Ottoman oppression, yet he condemns the institution as an innovation in the Church, and quotes the Second Epistle to Timothy iv. 3, 4 against it: "For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but after their own lusts they shall heap to themselves teachers, having

itching ears ; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall turn aside unto fables." It is intelligible that even the Uniat monks of Venice, though they are in communion with the Latin Church, yet cherish no very friendly memory of this Vatican propagandist, Galanus.

In the time of the Crusades an unsuccessful effort was already being made to incorporate the Armenians in the Latin Church. In the 5th century, the Golden Age of Armenian literature, not a single Latin Father of the Church had been translated into Armenian ; but from the time of the Crusades onwards most of the works they translate at all are translated from Latin. Thus we find the works of St. Bernard and of St. Thomas Aquinas and of other mediæval schoolmen. In 1307 the Catholicos of the Armenians at the Council of Sis induced the Armenian King of Cilicia to recognise the Pope ; and Boniface the VIII. sent to the king a banner to fight the Saracens withal. Then grew up a legend about the Armenian Church analogous to that of the donation of Constantine, representing that the earliest Armenian and Georgian patriarchs had received their power of loosing and binding on earth from the Pope Sylvester early in the fourth century. The anxiety of Rome to gain the submission to herself of the Armenian National Church found expression in many forged documents, of which I select the following from Galanus as a specimen.

"EPISTLE OF LOVE AND CONCORD BETWEEN CONSTANTINE, SILVESTER, AND TIRIDATES ; TRANSLATED AT ROME AT THE ASKING OF THE REV. LORD LEONARD ABEL, BISHOP OF THE CITY OF SIDON.

"By the will and power of the Consubstantial Holy Trinity of Father incomprehensible, of His only-born Son, our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and our Liberator the Holy Ghost. This is the will, based on God and unchangeable, indited by command of Augustus, the great Constantine, ever victorious, King of kings, Emperor of the world of Rome, and of the Romans ; who, by power of the true God and glorious cross, governs the entire world from the limits of the vast ocean to the rising sun. Also by the command of the great Pontifex of the Romans, successor of Peter and Paul and of the Apostles, holder of the keys of heaven, to bind all nations and loose in heaven, and presiding over the whole Church of Christ. Summoned by the Holy Spirit the king of the Armenians Johannes, called also Tiridates, and with him the witness to Christ and active confessor Grigorius, illuminator of those in East and North, our well-loved brothers in Christ, these good friends of our lofty primacy, most trustworthy leaders and sharers of our high counsel—these have come hither, to behold our city of Rome, mistress of the West and East, inheritor of the holy and chief Apostles, and to visit their Vicar the venerable Pope, and the glorious prince lately converted to the Christian faith, and the great Empress Helena. Wherefore with due pomp we went out to meet the Lord of Ararat and his band of compatriots, and, having first interchanged greetings with him, we entered the Church of the Holy

Apostles and adored their divine and holy relics and glorified Christ who crowns the saints."

Then, after solemn professions of alliance between the two kings and the Pope, (in these, the Armenians are confounded with the Turcomans!) the letter continues as follows:—"I, Sylvester, supreme Pope of Rome and all the world, seeing that the Cæsar Constantine has honoured the king of Great Armenia, Tiridates, for his power and has glorified the race and land of the Haik, I therefore hastened to do honour to the great confessor my colleague Grigorius. . . . Wherefore we blessed him in the name of the Holy Trinity, laying on his venerable head the right hand of the holy Peter and the sacred linen Sudarium (or kidaris) of Jesus Christ, and made him Patriarch of Great Armenia and his successors after him. And we ordained that the Patriarch of Armenia lay hands also on the Catholicos of the land of the Virk (*i.e.* Georgia) and have power to consecrate and set bishops over those Armenians who are anywhere dispersed among other Christian nations. Let also the land of the Albani be under the power of the Armenian Patriarch, let the king of the Albani nominate a Catholicos, and let the Armenian Patriarch ordain him. . . . Wherefore 'tis our high command that the high priest of the Armenians have the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth. Whomsoever he, in accordance with the Apostolic cautions, shall bless, let them be blessed by Christ our Lord, by the Holy Apostles and other saints, and by ourselves, and let those excommunicated by him remain in excommunication until they repent."

And let thus much of this very clumsy forgery suffice. It is written in very bad and late Armenian, and seems the work of a Latin impostor, not wholly at home in the Armenian tongue.

A long line of Bishops at Nakhitchewan in the East of Armenia recognised the Pope throughout the Middle Ages; and in the seventeenth century Latin missionaries like the learned Galanus were active in Constantinople and Tiflis and even in Edschmiazin. These missionaries were supported and championed by the French king; for, needless to say, they met with strenuous resistance at the hands of the orthodox Armenian Clergy. In the days of Louis XIV. of France, the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, who was especially keen in persecuting those Armenians who had become Latin Catholics, was kidnapped, put on board a French ship, brought to France, and incarcerated in the Bastille. Only last year I happened in Paris to buy an old Armenian book written by Galanus, which had belonged to this Patriarch. This is the place to speak of the well-known Armenian Convent at Venice. This convent was founded by one Mechitar, who was born near Erzeroom in 1676. As a child his mind was shaped by Jesuit missionaries, and a strong desire formed in him to see Rome. But he could not get so far, and was content to set up a school in Constantinople, for the enlightenment, secular and religious, of Armenian boys. Before long he was accused of Jesuitry by the Armenian Patriarch, and banished from the Turkish Empire about the year 1700.

Then he founded an order and monastery in the Venetian territory in the Morea. But the Morea was captured by the Turks in 1715, when Mechitar, by permission of the Government of Venice, established his convent on the Island of San Lazaro, where it still exists, a goodly and well-endowed edifice. The literary activity of the Monks of Venice has been admirable; they have compiled dictionaries and grammars of their language which are monuments of erudition; they have printed in beautiful form all the leading classical works of their ancient language; they have translated into modern Armenian,—which differs as much from ancient as Italian from Latin,—all kinds of useful modern books, devotional, scientific, historical, and economic. Their versions of Western poets include Virgil, Dante, Milton, and Byron; their leading idea has been rather to raise and educate their compatriots to the level of Frenchmen and Italians, than to pitchfork them into the Roman Communion. But in the eyes of the Pope he that is not with me is against me, and consequently the Monks of Venice have had to choose between the position of enlightened independence and of thorough submission to the College of the Propaganda. On the whole, they have conformed with the demands of the latter institution and have thereby forfeited some influence which they would otherwise have had among the Armenians of Russia and Turkey. From time to time learned members of their congregation have even forsaken them and renewed their allegiance to the old Armenian Church, because they could not bring themselves to make so clear and strong an avowal as the Pope required to be made of the heresy of the ancestral Church of their nation. But the services of the Monks of Venice to their country can never be either overrated or forgotten. Without them the Armenian language and literature would have remained unknown to the savants of Europe, and the grievances and oppression of their country unknown to our historians and politicians. Doubtless in the West the Roman influence has been of a reactionary kind, but in Armenia it has ever been as a light shining in the darkness.

I have now to describe all too briefly a great religious heresy, or movement in favour of spiritual freedom and enlightenment, which had its heart and origin in the south of Armenia in the latter part of the eighth century, which spread from Armenia to Bulgaria and thence to the rest of Europe, and did much to determine the future course of Christian life and thought. This movement,—which counted its martyrs by hundreds of thousands, and in destroying which in Asia Minor the orthodox Armenians and the Emperors of Constantinople laid the empire open to the Khaliphs and paved the way for Muhammadan dominion over those regions,—was known as the Paulician heresy, and originated with one Constantine, an Armenian of Mananalis who was born about the middle of the seventh century, near Samosata, not far from Ur of the Chaldees, whence went forth Abraham to preach and practise the faith of the one true God. It seems that a Marcionite Church had survived in that district, and Constantine was doubtless brought up within it. A man draws his religious opinions from his

surroundings, and so, to understand this heresy, we must know something of what Marcion held to be true. His teaching was directed to moralize the familiar scheme of the creation and fall of man and of his redemption through Jesus Christ, as may be gathered from the following account of his theology, drawn from the Armenian writer Eznik. There are in his system three primeval powers underlying all things : firstly a Divine Being who is all good, whom he denominates the Other God ; secondly a Divine Power partly good, but inclining to be bad, whom he calls the God of the Law or of the Old Testament. There is thirdly, *matter*, which he impersonates and calls by the Greek word *Hulê*. The two latter by their union created man, matter yielding his body and the God of Creation his spirit. Thus created, man was set in a garden, wherein the God of the Law revealed to him the death which hung over him as over all other creatures. This revelation alienated the heart of the man from the matter out of which his body was composed. This gave umbrage to matter, who, to spite the God of Creation or of the Law, invented a host of idols, in worshipping which man altogether forgot the God of Creation or of the Law, who in wrath thereat cast him down into hell. Then the God of Good and of otherness whom, in Armenian phrase, Marcion called Autar, this God who sat in heaven, beholding so many innocent generations of men lying in the tortures of hell through the action of the two deceivers, namely the God of the Law and matter, had pity upon them and sent his Son in the likeness of a slave to save them. His Son healed the sick and sinful, and forthwith the God of the Law became envious of Him and had Him crucified by the children of the Law. But after all, Christ did not really die on the Cross, but only seemed to ; He really remained alive and went down into hell and let loose all the poor pagans who had been languishing there for ages. Then He returned to earth in His true Divine form and confronted the God of the Law who had brought about His crucifixion. He proved that the God of the Law ought to die in accordance with his own law, which says, "He that killeth another shall die, and he that sheds another's blood, his blood shall be shed." However the God of Law pleaded that he had not known that Christ was Divine ; and he was acquitted upon condition of his abdicating and giving to Christ full control over all who believed in Him. Thereupon Christ appeared in a vision to Paul and sent him forth to preach to all nations how Christ has redeemed us and bought us for a price.

From this account of the heresy of Marcion we may see how the opposition between the Jewish Law and the Gospel, which is already found in germ in St. Paul's Epistles, was exaggerated, until the God of the Law, who created man and inspired the Old Testament, actually came to be contrasted as an evil spirit with the God of Love, who sent Christ into the world. This is an intensification of the tone assumed by St. Paul in such passages as the following, from 2 Corinthians iii. 13, "Moses put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished : But their minds were blinded : for until this day

remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away."

The seventh century was an epoch of revolt against what is merely external and materialistic in religion, and was marked by the two great movements, both directed to this end, of Muhammadanism and Iconoclasm. Three centuries earlier, in 337 A.D., the Bishop Eusebius had forbidden images and pictures of Christ, on the ground that no man knoweth the Son but the Father. Christianity was at that time still engaged in an uphill struggle against the worship of idols; and all the apologetic writers in attacking Paganism laid great stress upon the incomprehensibility of things Divine. Their doctrine was like that of Muhammad, that there may not be images made in corruptible matter of that which eye hath not seen nor ear heard. It was in keeping with such a tendency of thought that the Monophysites held that Christ's human nature has been swallowed up and lost in the Divine and transformed into an image of glory. But in the interval between the fourth and the seventh century Christianity in conquering Paganism had also imbibed much of its spirit. The old gods of Olympus and the demigods and heroes were only abolished in name; the idols, and the religious craving for visible gods which can only console itself with idols, remained, and accordingly the images were re-christened with names of saints and confessors, and retained. The best and most clear-sighted doctors of the Church, when they had to apologize for the adoration of images and relics, could but plead that they were requisite as a way of instructing the illiterate common people in the Christian religion. John of Odzun, Armenian Catholicos in 716 A.D., a fanatical persecutor of the image-breakers and of the Paulicians, could make no better defence of the worship of crosses and images, than that they represented beneficent powers, while the idols of the heathen had embodied devils. But even he, though he tolerated and encouraged image-worship, was infected with the spirit of the age, as when he writes thus: "Being in the flesh we cannot free ourselves from its bondage and join ourselves freely with the intelligible, and bring before ourselves, face to face, the grandeur of the Creator, which is invisible even to the cherubim. And for ever our rational nature longs to reach the Supreme First Cause, but by reason of the body loses its way and is hampered among the sensibles, and fails to distinguish from them that of which it is in search." He writes as above in explanation of the Pagan worship of idols; but exactly the same criticism applied to the worship of relics and images, and it was on this very ground that Leo III., the Isaurian (716-741), assailed the prevalent worship of images. Soldiers were sent in that and the succeeding reigns to destroy images and pictures in churches and shrines, and in 726 the great statue of Christ in Jerusalem was torn down and broken to pieces. The western Popes defended the cause of image-

worship, and in 731 Pope Gregory III. anathematized the iconoclasts. Nevertheless, in 754, Constantius Copronymus succeeded in getting as many as 338 bishops to meet in council and declare that images of Christ were unlawful, because since His Ascension the human nature of Christ has been deified and is incomprehensible and unpicturable. In spite of the anathemas of the Popes of Rome and of the enmity of the monks, the iconoclasts held the field until the close of the reign of Leo the Armenian, 842, when a compromise was arrived at in all the Eastern Churches, Greek, Armenian, and Coptic alike forbidding actual statues, but allowing pictures.

(Of this iconoclastic movement the Paulicians were the left and extreme wing. Their tenets it is difficult to ascertain to-day with desirable fulness, for their orthodox oppressors took care that none of their books should survive. The earliest writer who mentions them is John of Odzun, at the beginning of the eighth century; and he does not throw much light on them by his denunciations. We only gather that theirs was an extreme religious radicalism, approaching to that of our own Quakers, which abhorred every ceremony and rite which has not a direct and obvious spiritual and awakening power over the hearts of the congregation. I have said that in the Armenian Church the water in the rite of Baptism, the chrism in Confirmation, and the bread and wine in the Communion are believed to have a mystical efficacy, apart from the state of mind and consciousness of those who administer or receive them. Such a belief was held to be purely superstitious by the Paulicians; and they accordingly, like our Quakers or the Salvation Army, repudiated the sacraments of the Church for good and ever.

We learn more about them from the Greek orthodox writers, Photius, Primate of Constantinople in the ninth century, and Petrus Siculus, who in the same century lived among them for nearly a year in Tephrike, in Pontus, where they had founded a government of their own. The mission of Petrus was to treat for the restoration to the Greek Emperor of prisoners whom the Paulicians had taken in the course of the religious wars waged against them. These writers inform us about their tenets, which may be summarized as follows. —

1. They were, like the Persians and Manicheans and Marcionites, dualists, and held that underlying the universe are two opposed principles, one good, one evil. The evil god was the creator of the visible world of sense; the good God, our Heavenly Father, is creator of the world to come. They reproached the orthodox in such words as these: "You believe in the Creator of the Cosmos visible to the eye, but we believe only in Him about whom in the gospels the Lord says, 'Ye have neither heard His voice nor beheld His form.'"

2. Like the Marcionites, they believed that the Old Testament was written and inspired by the evil spirit, and accordingly they did not read it. The prophets, they said, were robbers and liars. But to the Gospels and Epistles of St. Paul they attached great value, and laid much stress upon their versions of the New Testament being true and accurate to the

original, upholding even a special order of Notaries to copy out the Scriptures. There is still preserved at Lyons a MS. of the New Testament which belonged to the Albigensian sect, who were the Paulicians of South France in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. It is a remarkably accurate version, far more so than those current among the orthodox Latin Christians of the Middle Ages. It was all-important that every one should read the New Testament; and in illustration of this point Petrus Siculus relates the following: Sergius, the great apostle of the Paulicians (800-834), who wrote several epistles to his Church, which were included by them in their canon of Holy Scripture, was converted by a woman, who asked him, "Why do you not read the Divine Gospels?" He answered, "It is not permitted to us laymen to read them, but only to the priests." She answered, "It is not so as thou supposest. For with God there is no respecting of persons; the Lord desires that all be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." Here we see how nearly these Paulicians were the forerunners of European Protestantism. The Armenian and Greek Church never explicitly forbade laymen to read the Bible, and it is only the Pope who has put the New Testament on the Index Expurgatorius. But although to-day it is free to any Greek or Armenian to read the Bible if he can, we may be sure that in the eighth and ninth centuries it was reserved to the priests only to do so. They alone would have had copies of it in their monasteries, and made them objects rather of superstitious reverence than of popular instruction.

It was the great stress laid on St. Paul's epistles that led the sect to call themselves Paulicians. Their teachers nicknamed themselves from Paul's epistles, *e.g.*, Constantine, founder of the heresy, called himself Sylvanus; and the various chief congregations were called after the Churches St. Paul founded, as Macedonia, Colossians, etc. The epistles of Peter, who quarrelled with Paul and upheld the Jewish law, they rejected from their canon of the New Testament.

3. They rejected Mariolatry. The Virgin was no more than a conduit pipe through which the phantasm of Christ's body came into the world. She was an ordinary woman in other respects, and bore other children after Jesus was born. Prayer and hymn to her they held to be utterly wrong and objectionable. The Church of Heaven is the true mother of us all, the heavenly Jerusalem. The enormity of such heresy in the East can only be appreciated by one who has entered Eastern or Romish Churches and seen how preponderating a share of popular reverence the Virgin Mary receives. This therefore is another approximation to Protestantism.

4. Christ's body was only phantasmal, for matter is devilish and the Divine Spirit could not really have been confined in it; *cp.* Marcion. Christ, they said, entered the kingdom of matter to reveal to us the invisible God and rescue us from the thralldom of matter and of the Evil One. Redemption is recovery of spiritual freedom and union with God.

5. They rejected, like the Protestants, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist,

and denied that we really partake of the body and blood of Christ. They even denied that it was real bread and wine which Christ gave His disciples. He was only symbolizing by His words and speaking in allegory. The Sacrament of Baptism was rejected in the same way. The water was a mere symbol of the Divine Word which cleanses the soul. "I am the living water," was their favourite text.

6. The worship of the cross they likewise condemned. It was "the accursed tree," mere wood. The true cross, they said, is the attitude of prayer. They denied that consecrated crosses have a healing and vivifying power and virtue, such as was attributed to them.

7. No priests, where no sacraments. Every one was his own priest. They had only itinerant preachers—*Sunecдеми*, as St. Paul called them—and their spirit is preserved to us in the one solitary fragment preserved to us of the Epistles of Sergius. It might have been penned by Wesley, and runs thus: "I have run from East to West, and from North to South, till my knees are weary, preaching the Gospel of Christ." These preachers had to dress like every one else, and were called pastors or teachers. No precaution, we see, was omitted against sacerdotalism.

9. In spite of the abuse of their orthodox oppressors, we know that a high moral ideal informed the daily life and homes of these Armenian heretics. They resembled our own Quakers, and based their lives on the Gospel, without being rigid or ascetic. "Their sober morality was not dependent on fasts, or feasts, or sacraments."¹ Politically they seem to have been nationalists, and opposed to extension of any alien power over Armenia. They called the Orthodox Greek Christians, by way of opprobrium, Romans, and denied that they were Christians at all.

10. It remains to notice their missionary efforts in Thessaly. Like other Armenians, they were for that age honest traders and workmen, and, brave soldiers. *Petrus Siculus* relates how he heard in *Tephrike* that they were sending missionaries to Bulgaria to seduce the Orthodox to their own damned heresy, and adds that these miscreants boldly underwent all toils and dangers in order to disseminate their doctrines. They were clearly animated by a missionary zeal rare among the Eastern Christians of to-day.

If the Greek Emperors had been wise, they would have protected these brave and honest heretics, and used them as a bulwark against encroachments of the *Khaliphs*. But the only idea was to harry and burn them alive. In A.D. 752 colonies of them were removed from Armenia, and planted by the Emperor of Constantinople in Bulgaria as a barrier against Bulgarians and Sclavonians. The subject is obscure from want of authorities; but it is certain that these Armenian colonists diffused their Paulician tenets on such a scale that during succeeding centuries the history of Bulgaria became the history of Paulicianism, only under the name of *Bogomilisin*, which is Slavonic for the cult of the lovers of God. In the years 813–820 the Paulicians in Armenia were terribly persecuted by a countryman of their own—

¹ From article on Paulicians in "Dictionary of Christian Biography."

Leo the Armenian, Emperor of Constantinople. Soon afterwards Theodora the empress, in her reign between 842-857, impaled and beheaded as many as 100,000. At last these naturally peaceful heretics were goaded by cruelty into revolt. They chose apt leaders, allied themselves with the Khaliphs, and overran all Asia Minor. In the mountains near Trebizond they even established a republic of their own, and fortified Tephrike, their chief centre. In 969 a second colony of them was transported by the Greek Emperor Zimiscas to Philippopolis. Crushed out in Armenia, the heresy took firm root among the Bulgarians, then in the act of receiving Christianity. There is ground for supposing that the Glagolitic alphabet in which the earliest Slavonic works were written, is based on the Armenian letters or on the cognate Georgian characters, which latter may well have been used in Tephrike, the centre of the Paulician missionaries. I believe that much of the old Bulgarian literature, especially the legendary religious lore which circulated unsanctioned by the Orthodox Greek Church among the common people, was translated from Armenian and Georgian. It is in old Bulgarian books that scholars must look for versions of the epistles of Sergius, the great Paulician teacher, and for a mass of Marcionite writings which the zeal of the Orthodox has elsewhere destroyed. This hypothesis of a connection of early Bulgarian literature with Armenian is antecedently so probable that it is worth testing. Many of the old apocryphs which circulated among the South Slavs are still preserved in Armenian, *e.g.*, The Book of Asenath,—Vision of Enoch,—Will of Twelve Patriarchs,—Letter of King Abgar to Jesus Christ,—Letter of Pontius Pilate to Tiberios,—Vision of Methodios (? of Patara),—History of Adam and Eve and of How They Were Created,—Progress of the Mother of God through Hell (in Armenian title is: "Vision of the All-holy Mother of God, which she saw in Hell, of the Tortures of the Wicked," etc.),—Revelation of Abraham (Armenian title: "History of Holy Confessor and Mystic Abraham"),—History of the Babylonian Kingdom and of the Three Children ¹ (Armenian title: "History of the Prophet Daniel, and Liberation of Shushan from the Condemnation of the Lawless Senate and Unjust Murder; also of the Three Children, Ananias, Azariah and Misaiëli, and of the Terrible Vision of the King"); this is unknown in Greek,—Gospel of Nicodemus,—Martyrdom of the Soldier Georgius,—Life and Miracles of St. Nicolaus,—History of the Magi who Came to Salute Christ,—Questions of St. John put to Christ on Mount Tabor (Armenian title: "On Transfiguration of our Lord on Tabor." The identity of the Armenian tract, which seems to be a translation of Chrysostom, with the Bulgarian is doubtful),—About the Devil which appeared in Wolf's Form,—The History of Gog and Magog,—The Story of Barlaam and Josephat,—Repentance of Adam,—History of Alexander,

¹ Pypin and Spasovic so give the title: *Geschichte der Slavischen Lit.*, vol. i., p. 102. In "*Archiv für Slavische Philologie*," band 2, p. 129, A. Weselofsky gives an account of the Slavonic saga *Vom Babylonischen Reich*, which seems another apogryph to the Armenian here mentioned, which however agrees in title with that which Pypin mentions.

etc. All, or nearly all, the apocryphal writings which exist in old Bulgarian circulated also in Greek in the Middle Ages ; and without a comparison of them in their Bulgarian form with the Armenian, it is not safe to say that they were translated from Armenian rather than from Greek. I throw it out merely as a suggestion of what is historically possible and probable.

The Paulician doctrines were carried from Bulgaria all over Europe, but especially to the North of Italy and the South of France, where they were known as the Albigensian heresy. The sect of Cathari—whence the German word *Ketzer* (heretic)—were akin to them. It is beyond my limits to follow the movement in Western Europe, and detail the awful persecutions to which the Albigensis were subjected by the Roman Inquisition. Suffice it to say, that in Western Europe they were the mediæval precursors of the Reformation ; and it is therefore through their Quaker-like heresies, which have not survived, rather than through their orthodox Church, which has, that the Armenians have contributed in a marked and permanent manner to the spiritual life of Northern Europe. It is equally remarkable that Bulgaria—the ancient Thrace—through which Paulicianism—the characteristic heresy of a hardy race of mountaineers, such as were the Armenians—should be the very country from which, according to Strabo and other ancient authorities, the Armenians originally migrated to the mountain ramparts of Asia Minor. One is tempted to believe that down through the centuries there had lingered in the Balkan highlands a substratum of kindred folk, to admixture with whom the Bulgarian invaders owed the facility with which they sympathized with and adopted the religious radicalism of Constantine and Sarkis. In spite of centuries of political oppression on the part of the Turks and of religious oppression on the part of the Greeks, we have seen the Bulgarians in the last few years reclaim and win back their liberties in both kinds. To-day they are making sure their political independence as an European State, and at the same time have attracted the anathemas of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, because they are determined to manage their religious affairs for themselves. May we hope that, as the Armenians long ago won the anathemas of the Orthodox Greek Church, so they may ere long be able to liberate themselves from the blighting curse of Ottoman misgovernment.

THE ORTHODOX-CATHOLIC EASTERN CHURCH, COMMONLY CALLED THE GREEK CHURCH.

By N. ORLOFF, M.A.

I.—GENERAL SKETCH.

THE subject of my present lecture is the Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church, commonly called the Greek Church; and the following eloquent summary of the present status of the Church is to be found in the pages of one of her latest English historians, Dr. Neale:—

"Extending herself from the Sea of Okhotsk to the palaces of Venice, from the ice-fields that grind against the Solovetsky monastery to the burning jungles of Malabar—embracing a thousand languages and nations and tongues, but binding them together in the golden link of the same faith—offering the tremendous sacrifice in a hundred liturgies, but offering it to the same God, and with the same rites—fixing her patriarchal thrones in the same cities as when the disciples were called Christians, first at Antioch, and James, the brother of our Lord, finished his course at Jerusalem—oppressed by the devotees of the false prophet as once by the worshippers of false gods—she is now as she was from the beginning, multiplex in her arrangements, simple in her faith, difficult of comprehension to strangers, easily intelligible to her sons, widely scattered in her branches, hardly beset by her enemies, as were her Divine founders, yet still and evermore what she delights to call herself—One only, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic."

In early times and, as it would now seem, for ever past, the same Church embraced the whole of the west of the then known world; but in those times even the popes thought and wrote that many of the Roman pontiffs were heretics (Pope Hadrian VI., "Dictates on the Fourth Book of the Sentences"), and that "in matters of faith an obscure layman had just as equal a voice as the highest officer in the Church" (Nicolas I., in his letter to Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople), inasmuch as the definition or determination of that faith does not depend on individuals, however exalted, nor on any number of them, however large, but on the Church as a whole. In those remote times the leaven of rationalism was not permitted to penetrate the united fold of Christ, and the first attempts to foist erroneous teaching of a local Church on the whole body were nipped in the bud by Pope Leo III., who caused the creed in its original, and the only acknowledged and permissible form, to be engraved on the tablets of silver. The poison, however, was not expelled, and the gangrene spread with such rapidity that soon Rome

herself had changed front, lending her, even at that time powerful, influence to the propagation of the error. Just one thousand years have passed since, and now, in consequence of the continuous working of that heaven, one part of the West is come to the deification of one man at the head of the community (Roman Catholics); another to well-nigh the same deification of every individual (Protestants), although neither have dared openly to repudiate Christ; a third—more logical—is rejecting Christ altogether (Unitarians); and in the remainder utter scepticism and unbelief prevail—no wonder that “standing fast” on the part of the Church by that which was entrusted to her from the beginning becomes utterly unintelligible to the Western mind, that her steadfastness is looked upon here as petrification, and the old teaching and the once common faith is accounted as difficult of comprehension. . . . It will be my endeavour this afternoon to do my best to make intelligible to you the guiding spirit and the first principles of the Church of which I aspire to the happiness of being an unworthy member.

What is Church? In a very respectable work, that mine of every student of Scripture, which is called, “A Complete Concordance of the Old and New Testament, by Alexander Cruden, M.A.,” of which some of you may have heard, “Body” is said to signify “the Church of God firmly united to Christ and among themselves, by the Spirit, faith, love, sacraments, word, and ministry, which, like the veins and arteries in the body, serve to join them with Christ, and among themselves, and also to convey influence and nourishment from the head to every particular member of this mystical body.” What would strike an orthodox Christian in this, otherwise remarkable and admirable definition, is the rather formal and dialectic way in which the ties that hold the body together are fractionized and multiplied. In the quotations given by the author—viz., those of 1 Cor. x. 17, Eph. iv. 16, and Col. i. 18—of all the six love only is mentioned. Now, in the 12th chapter of 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, the subject of the working of parts in one body is more fully and clearly set forth. Thence it appears perfectly evident that the Church must be an organism, a living body, that her members are firmly knit together and work harmoniously, that there should be no schism in the body. The eye cannot say to “the hand, I have no need of thee: or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary: and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour. . . . God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honour to that part which lacked . . . that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it” (1 Cor. xii. 21–26). It must be admitted that it was not a mere similitude when Christ, after the very last supper on earth with His disciples, spoke to them as follows

(John xv. 1-6): "I am the true vine, and My Father is the husbandman. Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit, He taketh it away; and every branch that beareth fruit, He cleanseth it, that it may bear more fruit. Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you. . . . Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, *except ye abide in Me*. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for *apart from Me ye can do nothing*. If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." The only indispensable condition of abiding in that heavenly vine and Christ's only commandment is, "to love one another" even as He had loved us; viz., in very deeds, not "words," for He directly adds, "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The same was to be the distinguishing feature of Christ's followers: "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John xiii. 35).

Therefore the one efficient and effectual tie that unites the body together is love.¹ No wonder that St. Paul so rapturously, but again not in a mere figure of speech, writes of love: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries, and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. . . . Love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up . . . seeketh not its own . . . beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. . . . Love never faileth" (1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 4, 7, 8).

Thus we distinguish in this living, spiritual organism: 1. Christ—the Head of whom St. Peter, almost on the very day when this body of Christ was sealed by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, who was to abide in it for ever, testified, under the inspiration from the same, that "there is no other name under heaven that is given among men wherein we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12); 2. The Spirit of God, even the life-giving Spirit of truth, that animates and guides it, of whom St. Paul testified, "all the gifts (even faith) worketh the one and the same Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 9, 11); and 3. The members, free rational beings, their mutual tie being the never failing, never-ending love.

The innermost, closest union of this spiritual organism, as indeed everything appertaining to God's mysteries, can be a matter of faith only;² but it follows from the above that—

¹ I do not by any manner of means intend to assert that there should be neither faith nor sacraments, neither word nor ministry; but all these are of a temporary character. There will be time when we shall see face to face. Shall we then love the less and cease to be members?

² Faith is always the result of a revelation known and recognised as such. It is the contemplation of an invisible fact as manifested in a visible form. It is not a mere belief or logical conviction, based on deductions, but it is something far higher. It is not an

1. The Church must be one, and can be but only one, embracing the whole human race, whether those who have already finished their earthly course, those still fighting for their freedom and truth in Christ, or yet to be born. Therefore she is invisible even as far as the inner working of the Spirit is concerned, and yet cannot but be visible and observable in that mutual tie which Jesus called the distinguishing trait of a Christian, viz., love and its manifestations in common creed and liturgy.

2. She must also be holy, on account of her only Head and animating and all-penetrating Spirit, and yet in her particular members admit of all the imperfections inherent in an earthly human being, their perfection not depending on individual exertions, and being in direct ratio to the degree of their unity with the whole.

3. Further, the truth as it is in Jesus must have been revealed to her from the beginning in its entirety, and can never differ, as Jesus Christ Himself is for ever the same, and God the Spirit takes of Christ and speaks only what things soever He hears (John xvi. 13).

4. Therefore, lastly, she must contain the plenitude of all grace, sufficient not only for her purposes of saving souls and perfecting mankind, but also for preservation of the revealed truth, pure, inviolable, and entire, through all generations, as light, as standard, as judgment, so that she can really be the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15).

Now all these—viz., the oneness, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity—are claimed, as Dr. Neale informs us, by the Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church; and with your permission and indulgence I propose to enter into some details with regard to these four heads, so as to enable you to see what she understands under these terms.

1. The unity must be real and organic, compatible with perfect freedom and true life, not merely outward and mechanic, tantamount to inanity and death. A grain of sand does not become a new being from the immensity of like grains, just as a brick put in the wall does not get changed or improved by the place assigned to it by the stone-mason; but every atom assimilated by a living organism becomes an inalienable part of that organism, and itself thus acquires new meaning, obtains new life. "Let us love one another that with one mouth we may confess," our Church calls on us in her liturgy, and that is her motto! Just as Christ Himself did not remain on earth to influence by His mere person and presence, but left the formation of another, spiritual body for Himself to the spiritual agency of another, the Comforter, so our Church does not erect, as kingdoms of this world are apt to and actually do erect, a visible standard of unity in the shape of a man, however exalted, or a book, however sacred, proclaiming that to recognise these is all-sufficient for unity,

act of comprehensive faculty separated from the others, but it is an act of all the faculties of mind captivated and enraptured in the highest degree by the living truth of a revealed fact. Faith is not thought or felt only, but is, so to speak, thought and felt together; in fine, it is not mere knowledge, but knowledge and life.

however much one may be at variance in his views on other points, or however differently he may understand the book. She could never give her consent to the violation of the freedom of conscience, or ever think of an Inquisition; no Bartholomew-night can be discovered on the pages of her history; neither would she entertain an idea of uniat Churches, or encompass sea and land just to be able to say only that there is one more proselyte found. She is one body and one soul. The oneness must of course show itself outwardly in manifestations of the principle of unity, and does so not in one tongue, but in dogmas confessed in a thousand tongues by the whole body, in sacraments recognised and held by all, even in rites, as these are but an expression of a relation of the community to the dogmas confessed by all. No branch of our Church, however large or distinguished, ever undertakes anything of importance, or introduces anything new, without first consulting and obtaining consent of other branches. Witness the whole history, beginning with the question of the date of the Paschal festival, throughout the era of councils, and down to the present time. Therefore the Greek Church does not know of a Church in the Church; viz., a teaching Church of pastors and a Church of sheep.¹ I do not mean to say that there is with us no distinction between clergy—viz., those who are called to devote themselves entirely to the stewardship of God's mysteries (1 Cor. iv. 1)—and laity, but the one does not say to the other, "I have no need of thee." "A Bishop is at one and the same time both the instructor of, and instructed by, his flock" (Bishop, afterwards Metropolitan Innocent). In matters of faith Patriarchs may be, and actually some were heretical, and may be corrected by mere laymen. Indeed, it is rationalism pure and simple not to recognise any other way of teaching besides that by word. The latter alone does not teach; it is life that instructs more eloquently than a whole volume of words.—Therefore, again, our Church does not sever the connection with the departed ones after the last clod of earth has been thrown over the grave, neither does she dispose of other worlds in *prematurely* delegating some of the departed to heaven and some to an intermediate place, before He to whom all judgment is given comes to avail Himself of the right. "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living (Matt. xxii. 32); for to Him all are alive," and our Church practises and enjoins continuation of the innermost connection in prayer²—that sweetest converse of souls and surest ladder to heaven—for and to the departed, beloved, or revered ones. She does so, however, not in the utilitarian, rationalistic spirit of bondage, but in the spirit of brotherly love, being sure of reciprocity; yet again, not because she does not account the great atonement as all sufficient for salvation, or admits any so-called works of supererogation, but

¹ A very suggestive division.

² Prayer (constant, continuous) is, as it were, the blood circulating in the body; it is her life and expression of that life; it is the speech of love, eternal breath of God's Spirit.

because she is alien to the worldly principle of *quid pro quo*, and, trusting to the efficacy of friends' prayers while they are still alive, an orthodox does not forget that the separation from the departed is merely another form of absence.—But while these manifestations of unity cannot but show themselves outwardly, particular members do not judge their brethren, and the community is indulgent, sometimes to a fault; it does not search the hearts, and does not refuse its visible membership to repentance, although merely outward. Those who do not belong to her pale the visible Church does not judge, for "to his own lord he standeth or falleth" (Rom. xiv. 4), and renegades she simply avoids as those who cut themselves from the community. Again, inasmuch as hidden ties that may unite visible Church with mankind without her pale are not revealed, we have neither right nor desire to delegate to damnation all those who do not belong to her, all the more that such an assumption would be in opposition to God's mercy. We are certain only that without Christ and without love to Him no one can be saved; but then Christ is not merely a historical revelation, as our Lord Himself announced in contrasting sin against the Son of man to sin against the Holy Ghost. Christ is not only a fact, He is law, an ideal realized, and therefore He may be worshipped without being known under that name. Everything that is truly humane, everything really grand or beautiful, everything that is worthy of respect, imitation, veneration—all these are they not merely different forms of one and the same name of our Saviour? It is therefore only those who have opportunities of ascertaining that in the Church there is the plenitude of all grace that would stand self-condemned for neglecting to avail themselves of the offered means to salvation; ¹ it would then be the sin against the Holy Ghost.

2. Moral liberty is an essential attribute of a finite mind. Its freedom is the liberty of choice between love to God and egoism; in other words, between righteousness and sin. This choice finally determines the relation of a finite mind towards its source,—viz., towards God; and the whole world is thus in sin either by deed or by liability to sin, being only preserved from actual sin by mere absence of temptation and by the grace of God. All creation therefore carries in itself its own condemnation, is removed from God, and cannot be reconciled to Him. Such is the law of justice, the inflexible, unchangeable, and inexorable law, of which the Old Testament law had been only a symbol. But the righteousness of the law does not yet appear. The infinite cannot be the standard for a finite being and, on the other hand, to a finite mind as being entirely in sin the latter becomes a real necessity, whilst righteousness remains only an abstract possibility not possessed of any real basis. But the infinite becomes in Christ (that Lamb of God slain before all ages) a finite being. Manifesting Himself in time, but being the eternal thought of the Father,

¹ That disposes of all cavils as to the intolerant spirit of the Church, and explains the partly deserved taunts of the almost utter absence of proselytism.

Christ, the man like unto us in everything, clothed in infirmity, subject to ignorance, suffering, and temptation, rises up in all the perfection of God's righteousness solely by the power of His human will. Thus from eternity Christ is the sole righteous condemnation of sin. He alone is the standard for all creation, and that is why to Him is committed all judgment, as God the Spirit made it known to us. But Christ is also the boundless love of the Father, and for that reason He is also the salvation which is solely possible to sinners. God's nature cannot admit sin inasmuch as sin in itself is a voluntary withdrawal from God. But the love of Christ does not abandon the creature. Christ unites Himself to every one who does not reject Him, takes upon Himself every sin whatsoever, and suffereth the penalty of sin, viz., death. By this means, however, the victory is also obtained. Sin (that egoism of creatures) voluntarily taken over by love, suddenly becomes transformed into a consummation of the sacrifice, and, so to speak, the crown of Divine perfection. On the other hand, by the same means by which Christ, in uniting Himself to the imperfect and guilty creatures, became responsible for sin, the sinner may become the partner in the perfection of his Saviour. Thus every one who does not repudiate Christ becomes reconciled to God; every sin is turned into righteousness, every sinner becomes the son of God. Therefore Christ is the eternal victory of God over evil; He is the sole condemnation of sin from the beginning, and eternal salvation of every sinner who does not disown Him. Evidently all moral relations between God and His creatures would get entangled, become mere conjectures, and would be utterly impossible without Christ, Jesus the Righteous, who is the beloved Son of the Father of mercies.¹ Thus God enabled us to see that the justice of the Father had manifested itself in the free perfection of His beloved Son, and that the boundless love of the Father had shown itself in the free love of the Lamb of God that was slain for His brethren. Everything is an act of freedom: both the righteousness of Christ which condemns us, and the love of Christ which saves us by that real and unspeakable unification to which He admits us. Yet everything is an act of justice, for justice (juridical) is nothing but the law of logic manifested; here also nothing has disappeared without a trace. Sin is not pardoned, not absolved, which would be contrary to the laws of reason, but it becomes transformed into perfection by means of a perfect union of man with His Saviour.—While then, in the struggle against Arianism, the Church asserted that in the world of intellectual beings nothing can equal God in moral perfection, and against Nestorius and Eutychus, that God and man are so far alike that God could become man, she brings it forcibly to our minds, and

¹ There is thus, I may add in parenthesis, no room for any so-called works of supererogation or merits where everything is but sin, and everything becomes righteousness in Christ only; no room for fanatical assertion of predestination where the only condemnation and the only salvation of sinners is solely human liberty in Christ, and it seems scarcely possible that one should fancy that he can dispense with Christ altogether and yet be acceptable to God.

makes it a bounden duty for every Christian never to remain content with any approximate nearness to perfection, but constantly and with all might to strive to the attainment of absolute perfection. Thus, although absolutely holy in this body (the Church) is its Head, Jesus Christ, and the plenitude of grace provided by the Holy Ghost,—the very striving after perfection on the part of individual members and local Churches reflects the lustre of that holiness throughout the whole body, and purifies the imperfections of others in the sight of Him who greets even intentions, and who is ever ready to spare ninety-nine sinners for one righteous man.

3. Now, the truth is purity and holiness itself, and could be communicated not to individuals or a number of them, but to the Church—that pure and spotless bride of Christ—as a whole. But the Church is a living organic body; therefore whatever had been imparted to her must of necessity have been assimilated by her, made into a part and parcel of the body. Thus it may be said that it was, *e.g.*, not St. Paul or St. John who had written the epistles and the gospel, but the Church herself; she singled these for distinction out of a mass of other writings, and honours those apostles by assigning to them the writings; authorship cannot possibly be a matter of dogma with us, so that supposing even that criticism succeeded in proving that certain writings or matters did not belong to the presumed authors, the books will not be one iota the less valuable; they will still remain with and for us, as much as before, sacred books. Nay, even if we take the extremely unlikely case of an entire loss of the text, the Church is capable of reproducing it, just as she was able to live before she accepted or adopted the writings, because it is herself, or, to speak more correctly, God the Holy Ghost who had written the books with her hand or delivered them by word of her mouth. Both the Scripture and the tradition¹ (of course, dogmatic) are one and the same manifestation of the Holy Spirit under different outward forms only, so that the one is nothing else but written tradition, and the other, living Scripture.—But what can be the relation of individual, however exalted, members to the teaching of the whole body? None other than that of humble submission and obedience, although the elucidation or assertion of that teaching might proceed from a new convert or a single deacon. Thus, at Antioch, the very leader of the holy band of Christ's disciples himself fell into an error which boded danger to all the future of Christian liberty, and rose up again not by any other means but by humble obedience to the voice of St. Paul, then only a new convert. The so-called successors of the first do not seem to understand even wherein St. Peter's greatness lay. This example teaches us to understand the relation of each of the apostles to the Church of apostles, and therefore also the relation of every believer to the Church in all ages. Thus, at the first Nicæan Council it was St. Athanasius, still only a deacon,

¹ But for the latter no Scripture would exist, as the canon itself is the product of tradition; it would not be preserved, or would be misunderstood and perverted, but for that living voice of tradition, guided by the ever present Holy Spirit of truth.

who bore the whole weight of defence of the truth against powerful Arians, and carried the day. What had made the distinction between councils, some being known as œcumenical, and others either not accounted as of such importance, or called false, heretical councils? Was it a number of bishops, or the influence of the representatives? By no manner of means. The first Council of Nicea was attended by 318 representatives only, while the so-called semi-Arian (at Rimini) counted over 500 members, and had might and so-called intelligence on its side. It was the Church as a whole who gave her assent and ratified the conclusions of the first, and rejected as heretical those of the second, the consensus of the whole body being the assurance of the presence of the Holy Spirit with the first, viz., "*Vox populi vox Dei*" in the highest conception of that saying. That is why the Church, from the time of the apostles, had always prefaced the conclusions to which the councils came with the formula: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (Acts xv. 28). Why, again, did every council ratify the decisions of its predecessors, but as a proof that the Church had borne, through her representatives, witness to her assent and consent? Therefore the councils themselves did not introduce anything new, but what was already, at least implicitly, known and taught by the Church. Take the case of *ὁμοούσιον*. Is the word to be found in the Scriptures? Nowhere. How is it then that those with whom the letter of the Scripture is the be-all and end-all, also accept it? With us it is the word of the Church continually striving to express that which can never be adequately expressed: human word is not able either to define or to describe God and things Divine as they are in themselves, in their substance and essence.—It is this constant endeavour which had been, is, and shall ever be at work, and which is loosely called the development that can be discovered in the history of the Church, and which alone must satisfy cravings for something new of the so changeable and continually changing human mind. This presents a very wide field for manifestation of the powers of human faculties in investigation and elucidation, and the Church does not only sanction these exertions, but avails herself of the results of these labours of individual minds, provided they are in accord with her own ideas, and provided she thinks it fit or opportune to adopt them. In no other book of the New Testament was the expression "Word" used, although exact equivalents of it are to be found in them all. But it was used in the very first verse of the Gospel of St. John—admittedly one of the latest productions of the apostolic era—and it was adopted, because it expressed more concisely and lucidly the idea of the Church, and because the Church found in her bosom a new element—new historic life in pupils of the Greek philosophy. Such expressions as eternal generation, eternal procession, Trinity, Persons, etc., appear and come into general use by degrees only, but such kind of progress does not go beyond the domain of analytic terminology, and by no manner of means can be taken for development of doctrine, the latter remaining for ever the same.—There was but one great

day of Pentecost, when God the Holy Ghost, that Comforter who was to teach the Church all things, and to bring to her remembrance all that Christ had said (or done) to His disciples, who was to guide her into all the truth, and to bear witness of Christ,—when He came down on those united in love, in prayer and veneration, under the significant form of fiery tongues, to for ever abide in the Church. And it appears to us presumptuous, nay blasphemous, to expect another; it would mean the rejection of the promise that the Church will never be forsaken, and would again amount to the sin against the Holy Ghost. The perversion of man's mind, in his rationalistic pride, cannot go further than the belief in any other and personal, individual revelation but the one which was given to the Church, and which is sufficient for everything that appertains to life or salvation. A Joseph Smith¹ may forge anything, and it will be swallowed as Holy Scripture; only Jesus Christ must remain merely the son of a carpenter.

4. Thus united, holy and catholic, the Church, from the great day of Pentecost, possesses the plenitude of all grace for her high and great mission. For her inner life and working she possesses sacraments, the most tangible manifestation of God's grace which is vouchsafed to the earth by heaven; they are seven in number, and remain still in all their pristine apostolic purity. At the same time, for those who are without her pale,—who, as St. Paul puts it, “being ignorant, going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God” (Rom. x. 3)—she is a mirror in which are reflected their deviations from the right path, and she may yet be as light and standard to some and judgment to others. Thus while there is a tendency in one community which is so anxious to secure by any means the utmost number of members, to use even force in proselytizing, and while in others the regeneration imparted in baptism is exaggerated so much as to make other sacraments unnecessary, and which *per contra* leads to another extremity of denying any regeneration at all,—our Church particularly insists that baptism should be looked upon as the most perfect triumph of human liberty, when the baptized declares his willingness to believe with all his heart, viz., submit himself to the action of the redeeming grace which opens to him the door into the New Testament Church. Therefore, directly after baptism another sacrament had always been and is performed,—that of imposition of hands, which, from time immemorial, was substituted for by Chrisma, consecrated by bishops only, and in which are imparted the gifts necessary to one of an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation (1 Pet. ii. 9),—viz., a kind of first grade in the Church. Now, this has been turned into confirmation (with Protestants' unmeaning examination), and is performed years after baptism. Is it, then, a second baptism, the first being insufficient? In our Church a second baptism is provided in the sacrament of penance, and from her point of view it is not difficult to understand the necessity for such a sacrament. Humility and self-condemnation are in the power of

¹ Like the founder of Mormonism, Joseph Smith.

every member, but the grace of absolution is in the Church, and is entrusted by her to the stewards of God's mysteries, who by that means reintroduce into the fold those who, in their contrite heart, think themselves unworthy of remaining as members of the holy body. Look into what a worldly instrument the confessional box has been turned by the Roman Catholics, and the natural revulsion of the Protestants who reject this sacrament altogether, having made the Church of every individual ! With us there can, of course, be no question of works of satisfaction, as epithemias are mere disciplinary and, so to speak, dietary prescriptions. One can now understand why this sacrament precedes that of Eucharist, in which man enters into the most perfect union with Christ, and really and truly partakes of the body and blood of Christ. How earthified is this sacrament in one community which deprives the laity of the cup, and how spiritualised and, so to speak, evaporated it becomes in other bodies, as if the Paschal Lamb was not as good a symbol, if only a symbol was necessary ! Here rationalism undisguised is rampant in the West with the question of atomistic chemistry. Our Church could never raise the question as to the relation in Eucharist between the body of Christ and the elements, for she knows that God's acts in sacraments do not confine themselves to the outward, external things, but avail themselves of the elements as intermediaries between Christ and the Church. It is by the faith and prayer (no wonder rejected by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike) of the latter as a whole that the sacrament becomes accomplished, and bodily unification of her members with Christ actually takes place, for justification of worthy partakers and condemnation of others. "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have called you," said our Saviour to His disciples, and God the Holy Ghost, by His apostle (Paul), laid it down that "without any dispute the less is blessed of the better" (Heb. vii. 7). Thus the Church has always taught. She does not begin with imperfection in order to arrive at a perfect state ; her point of departure is perfection and omnipotence which draw up to themselves imperfection and infirmity. For that reason, the plenitude of the rights of the Church which Christ had handed to His apostles always remains with the pinnacle of her hierarchy. By bishops only are the lower grades consecrated, and therein lies the significance of their office and their immeasurable importance, inasmuch as it is through the bishops that the Church on earth remains united, through all generations, to her Divine Founder ; and through them she feels herself continually lifted up to Him whose hands were imposed on His apostles. For this reason also the Church recognises their decisions in matters of discipline, holds them entitled to the right and honour to declare her decisions as to dogmas, although leaving it to herself to judge whether her faith and tradition are truthfully witnessed by them, and delegates chiefly to them the service of the word and instruction, although she does not deprive any of her members of the right granted by the Holy Spirit to whomsoever He listeth. All these, evidently, are in close connection with the hierarchical

offices, and do not in the least depend on moral perfection of individuals, to the attainment of which it is everybody's duty to strive, and which therefore cannot be the privilege of anyone. The pope, with his pretensions, cannot be looked upon as a bishop, and is therefore consecrated by those who are immeasurably below him. Who should blame then presbyterians? What, again, do we see as a consequence of the rejection of orders as a sacrament? More than seven hundred she-reverends in America, and yet with them it is the Bible and nothing but the Bible. Where is then St. Paul with his "I suffer not a woman to teach or usurp (1 Tim. ii. 12) the dominion over a man, but to be in quietness"? If the imposition of hands in the sacrament of orders had ceased, all the other sacraments would cease also (baptism only excepted), and the human race would be deprived of all grace, for then the whole Church would have proclaimed that Christ had rejected her. "Not so was in the beginning," said our Saviour: God created husband and wife (not man and woman). For the husband his wife is not a woman, just as for the wife her husband is not one of many men; the whole world for the couple is sexless. Therein lies the difference in the idea of marriage entertained by the Church and other Christian communities. Marriage is neither a treaty, a duty, nor a legalized slavery; it is an organic and, therefore, mutual unification of the two children of God. It is a sacrament and a mystery. The Church never sanctions separation of the newly baptized from their (former) wives, Protestants having rejected sacramental character of the marriage, were obliged to admit freedom of divorce, and have thus turned the married state into legalized adultery; and the Roman Catholics, who do not admit divorce at all, even in cases of adultery, changed it into slavery. The idea of organic and mutual unification,—viz., inner sanctity of the married state—is lost in both cases, for, from strictly Christian point of view, adultery is the death-blow to the marriage, just as divorce is legalized adultery. In the sacrament of oil the Church sits, as it were, in judgment over the earthly frame of man, and either cures him when nothing else does, or suffers death to destroy that frame as one not more necessary for the visible Church and God's unfathomable ways. It is not the extreme unction with us, and cannot produce "Peculiar People," with their faith-healing, as they appeared among Protestants in consequence of the rejection of the sacrament.

Such is the teaching of the Church with regard to sacraments, and this is the outcome of the Roman Church having once forgotten how indispensable love is, and having introduced into the creed unwarranted innovation, without even so much as announcing the fact to her sister, the, at that time great, Church of the East, thus implicitly treating the latter as a flock of helots not worthy to be taken any notice of. The fratricide Cain had also once answered that he was not a custodian to his brother. . . . Once a part of a body arrogates to itself such a right, such privilege of the grace of the Holy Spirit, and the inevitable consequence for that body can

be but one, viz., a revolt within her own fold until individual particles come to arrogate to themselves the same right. . . . The deification of the pope (or shall we call it the eighth Christian sacrament, in virtue of which he becomes the oracle of God) to stop the process of disintegration, would not, we venture to think, achieve the purpose. And therein lies our firm belief and fondest Christian hope that our brethren in the West will see at last the absurdities to which they have, unintentionally and unwillingly, no doubt, arrived.

But what did the Church do in her councils and in her creed? Do these not prove that truth was not wholly revealed to her from the beginning? No; what the Church did do in her councils and her creed had been to more explicitly, on account of special circumstances, bear witness to what she implicitly knew before. In her Nicean Creed she defined the Godhead itself. Later, in the schools of Nestorius and Eutichus, there appeared the tendency to pervert the tradition of the Church as to the relation of God to His intellectual creatures. The first refused to recognize Christ as true God, the other, as true man; they both placed between God and man an impassable abyss, and taught that it was impossible for God to become mortal being possessed of the choice between good and evil, and thus deprived man of the great happiness of being able to penetrate with his love into the unfathomable depths of God's love. But the Church asserted in her conciliar testimony that man is the image of his creator, and that God therefore might and really did become man. The abyss was bridged over. Thus man is exalted by the possession of the right to investigate the perfection of the eternal Being, and, at the same time, acquires the sacred duty in his own person to strive after the moral perfection, as he is made into God's likeness. Still later, by erroneous teaching of Monothelites, was called forth yet another testimony of the Church as to the identity between moral nature and will, and the natural perfection which was manifested by the Incarnate Word within the limits of His human nature. One more question began greatly to agitate the Church. Namely: pious use of icons (holy pictures) was admitted by the Church from time immemorial, but popular ignorance turned the veneration into idolatry. Unreasonable and passionate zeal of some pressed the Church to condemn the custom itself, which would have amounted to the total deprivation of liberty. But the Church as a living body, animated by the Holy Spirit, had the right to glorify God's majesty both in word, sound and image, and she declared full liberty of worshipping God under any symbols which love might suggest to the *unanimity* of Christians. Thus while the other councils had saved Christian doctrine, the last (second Nicean) saved the liberty of Christian feeling. And quite recently, while protesting through the Eastern Patriarchs against the perversion of God's irrevocable law, that death is the penalty of sin, which law was made known to our progenitors and was manifested also in the demise of the Holy Virgin, whose birth the then pope was, however, about to proclaim

to have been free from the original sin, the Church declared, in anticipation even of the dogma of papal infallibility (then still in embryo and a mooted point), that *the knowledge of God's truth is granted to the mutual love of Christians only, and has no other controller or guardian besides that love.*

"This is the apostolic faith, this is the faith of the Fathers, this is the Orthodox Faith, and this Faith has established the world!" is the declaration which is this very day (quite accidental coincidence it may be) made in the Churches of the East, it being the day devoted to the solemnization of the triumph of Christian liberty achieved by the Church in the second Nicæan Council, and I cannot do otherwise than re-echo it, and say Amen to it.

Readily do we acknowledge, and sometimes too hastily adopt, the results of the great achievements of the Western mind and spirit in the affairs of this world, but in matters of faith the Eastern is, as it has ever been, the source and cradle of everything that is purest, highest and heavenly. Humiliating though it might appear to the haughty spirit of the West, it will at last, and of necessity, turn its eye towards the East and realize the saying :

Ex Oriente lux !

II.—THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

Nearly three years have now elapsed since Kiev, that most ancient capital of Russia, presented, for the month of July, an unusually animated appearance. Representatives of the orthodox faith from every quarter of the globe came there, and Christian greetings and well wishes arrived from the most distant parts of the world; amongst numberless others, a sympathetic epistle from His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury had also reached the festive city and was duly honoured. It was the nine-hundredth anniversary of the introduction of Christianity into Russia that was solemnized there with great rejoicings, and it cannot be gainsaid that the state and the people had as much an occasion as the Church to take part in those festivities.

"By Russia's faith," so said the hymn composed expressly for the occasion and sung at the festival, "is our state free and stable. Glory to Vladimir, the Prince of Kiev—the anciently throned! Nine centuries are past; on the foam of the ninth wave, the shield of our faith is secure, the bequest of bygone times is strong, the banner of orthodoxy is waving, shining forth afar. Rejoice, O Prince Vladimir—isapostolic Prince; Endeared to the heart of the people, the elect of the holy faith, to-day, O Prince, we sing thy day, together with the whole Russian land. If the land is not to be measured, if the inhabited places on it cannot be counted, —to God of strength be prayer, to Prince Vladimir the praise! Glory!" Thus the participation in the festival on the part of the state and people at large was only the due recognition of the inestimable service which the Orthodox Church and faith had done to the Russian people and state

In the present lecture I propose to offer you a historic retrospect of the Orthodox Church in Russia, from her inception there down to the present day, thus enabling you to see the actual application and working of that guiding spirit and those first principles which were the subject of my previous lecture.

Russia claims also at least an apostolic visit to her precincts, and a blessing, if not actual introduction of Christianity, by an apostle. Her great annalist, Nestor, in his chronicles, relates that St. Andrew, the first called of the twelve, ascending up and penetrating by the Dnieper into the deserts of Scythia, planted the first cross on the hills of Kiev, and, "See you," said he, to his disciples, "these hills? On these hills shall shine the light of Divine grace. There shall be here a great city, and God shall have in it many churches in His Name." But this is merely a venerable tradition, although not an unlikely one, as it is certain that the same apostle had preached the Gospel and appointed Stachys to be the first Bishop of Byzantium, from which city the rays of Divine light, after an interval of nine centuries, are historically known to have beamed upon Russia.

The nine centuries succeeding that apostle's visit had witnessed so many peregrinations and changes of masters of the land that it is a matter of wonder how the aboriginal Slavs were enabled to outlive them. (Is it not a signal proof of a singular vitality of the race?) All the successive hordes of Asiatics, that migrated into and overrun Europe, one after another, had come in contact with, and subjugated first, the Slavs; thus, for centuries, even before Christianity was introduced, the great virtues of patience and endurance in subjection were roughly taught to them. Left at last to themselves, after centuries of perpetual subjugation, they were unable to manage their own affairs and sent across the seas to invite those who would rule and govern them. Essentially agricultural, peaceful and commercial people, the Slavs wanted those who would defend them from continual incursions of nomadic barbarians, and guarantee to them quiet pursuit of their peaceful and gentle avocations. A whole clan of warrior Normans, with their chief, Ruric, in 862 (the very year of invention of Slavonic alphabet) answered the call and supplied even, as it is supposed, the very name "Russ" to the adopted country, bringing with them their turbulent, predatory, and quarrelsome habits, and yet assimilating themselves, although by slow degrees, to the aborigines and their characteristic customs. "The domicile" of the Slavs "was so remote from the centre of ancient culture that Greeks and Romans could scarcely come into direct contact with them; and having always been, as they are still, by nature a peaceable people, they themselves never greatly interfered in the affairs of their border lands," observes Dr. Vilhelm Thomsen in his lectures on "The Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia," and the Scandinavians—we may add—assisted in accelerating that contact and in bringing the light of Christianity to their hearts and homes. Heathenism of the southern Slavs was not of a fanatical character, as that,

e.g., of Scandinavians and their own north-western brethren; it was of a purer kind and mild in its form; there were with them neither priests nor idols, the latter having been introduced by the Northmen. As Procopius says, the Slavs acknowledged one God, Lord of the universe, but worshipped also rivers, nymphs, and some other deities to whom they offered sacrifices, practising also divination by this same means. Thus whilst worship of one God and of powers of nature can still be traced in popular songs and customs, nothing remains of idols, their temples or priests. This explains also their ready conversion to Christianity, the difficulty devolving rather on those Northmen who were instrumental in bringing its light to their notice.

The seeds of that faith had been sown there by occasional and slow, but sure degrees. It appears that Ascold and Dir, two princes of Kiev and of the companions of Ruric, were the first to embrace Christianity. Already in 866, viz., four years after their settlement in Russia, they made their appearance in armed vessels before the walls of Constantinople, when the Emperor was absent, and threw the Greek capital into no small alarm and confusion. Tradition reports that the Patriarch Photius took the original robe of the Mother of God from the Blachern Church and plunged it beneath the waves of the Strait, when the sea immediately boiled up from underneath, and wrecked the vessels of the heathen. Struck with awe, these princes believed in that God who had smitten them, and became the first fruits of their people to the Lord. The hymn of victory of the Greek Church, "To the protecting Conductress," in honour of the most holy Virgin, has remained a memorial of this triumph, and even now among the Russians concludes the office for the First Hour in the daily matins, for that was indeed the first hour of salvation to the land of Russia. Eighty years afterwards we find already mention of a *Cathedral Church of the Prophet Elias*, at Kiev, where the Christian-Variagians swore to the observance of the treaty concluded with the Greeks; and in Codinus' Catalogue of sees subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, the metropolitical see of Russia appears as early as the year 891. Certain it is, however, that the wisest of the daughters of the Slavonians, the widowed Princess Olga, who governed Russia during the minority of her son Sviatoslav, afterwards, in 965, undertook a voyage to Constantinople for no other end than to obtain a knowledge of the true God, and there received baptism at the hands of the Patriarch Polyeuctes, the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, an admirer of her wisdom, being himself her godfather. Nestor draws an affecting picture of the Patriarch foretelling the newly illumined princess the blessings which were to descend by her means on future generations of the Russians, while Olga had now by baptism become Helena, that she might resemble both in name and deed the mother of Constantine the Great. Her example and entreaties, however, did not affect her fierce and warlike son. He simply had no taste for Christianity, and pursuing his constant expe-

ditions, left its seed to germinate and spread without let or hindrance; even his own children remained under the influence of their grandmother, the isapostolic Olga. In vain did Vladimir, who from the eighth to eleventh year of his life had resided at Novgorod, separated from the saintly Olga, attempt to prop up heathenism against the more powerful light of Christianity. Having, in 980, his eighteenth year, become the Grand Duke of Kiev and the sole possessor of the even then rather extensive Russian land, he did introduce in Kiev also all the paraphernalia of the idol-worship which he had learned during his two years' residence beyond the seas, and set up a very large wooden idol of Peroon with silver head and golden moustache; but, after seven years of very successful wars with his eastern and western neighbours, he felt himself still obliged to cast about anxious looks for a better faith and to receive different religious embassies which were no doubt attracted by his fame.¹ It is certainly remarkable that such a sensual religion as the Mahometan, which was the first offered by Bulgarians from the Volga, did not entice the man, who was given up to the indulgence of his passions, and that the Western doctors were dismissed by him with these words: "Return home, our ancestors did not receive this religion from you," unless we take into consideration his Norman descent; still more unaccountable is Prince Vladimir's hesitation even after the preaching of a certain Greek philosopher, Constantine, had deeply affected him. He consults his elders, and with their advice sends his own representatives to the different countries, that they might see and judge on the spot of the respective merits of each faith. Last of all his ambassadors were sent to Constantinople, and reported that in the temple (St. Sophia), "in truth God has His dwelling with men," and that they can never forget the beauty "they saw there." Even then it was only the name of his grandmother Olga, the wisest of women, which was recalled by the prince's Boyars in witness of preferring the orthodox faith, that turned the balance. Such however was St. Vladimir's circumspection in preserving entire independence of himself and his state, that, although he had asked "where shall we be baptized?" he first declared war to Constantinople, took, after a long siege, the Greek city of Cherson, obtained the hand of the Emperor's sister Anne, and then only, in 988, was actually baptized. But having thus "ten times measured to cut once," as the Russian saying is, St. Vladimir became then a thorough Christian, an entirely changed man; his five wives and scores of concubines were dismissed, his dissipated habits and drunken revels put an

¹ The details of the way in which the orthodox faith was selected and embraced by the prince, as well as of the most remarkable and entirely peaceable baptism in one day of an entire city, can be found in Mouravieff's "History of the Church of Russia," translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, in Dean Stanley's "Lectures on Eastern Church," and in an admirable little work on "The Conversion of the Slavs," by the Rev. Maclear, D.D. The latter exhibits, in a particularly striking manner, although the author himself does not seem to notice it, the contrast between the exclusively spiritual way in which the Greek Church had spread, and between the Latin, continually striving to make converts by the sword and other worldly means.

increased and supported by his son Yaroslav, had brought the enlightenment of Russia, in the middle of the eleventh century, to such a high standard as to almost equal that of Greece, whilst western Europe still remained mostly in a barbarous or transitional state, and could not even dream of it at the time. These efforts were, besides, greatly assisted by monasteries established by Russians themselves, which gave Russia her first historians, such as Nestor; the first orators, such as Cyrillus, Bishop of Turov; and the leading scholars in general, some of them speaking not less than five foreign languages; at that time all the bishops and even the Metropolitan (Hilarion) were Russians. From their writings, still preserved, one can easily see that Christianity was not a mere matter of form with them or that it was only outwardly received. Thus humanely, for example, wrote Vladimir Monomach (†1113): "O my children, praise God and love men. For it is not fasting, nor solitude, nor monastic life, that will procure you eternal life, but only doing good. Forget not the poor; nourish them; remember that riches come from God, and are given you only for a short time. Do not bury your wealth in the ground: this is against the precepts of Christianity. Be fathers to orphans. Be judges in the cause of widows, and do not let the powerful oppress the weak. Put to death neither innocent nor guilty, for nothing is so sacred as the life and the soul of a Christian. . . . Do not desert the sick. . . . Drive out of your heart all suggestions of pride, and remember that we are all perishable; to-day full of hope, to-morrow in the coffin. Abhor lying, drunkenness, and debauchery. Endeavour constantly to obtain knowledge. Without having quitted his palace my father spoke five languages—a thing which wins for us the admiration of foreigners."

One could not but expect further development and progress in enlightenment and in strengthening the position of the Russian state among other European States. From the advantages the Russians possessed, of having a perfect and uniform language (whilst those of other nations of Europe were either barbarous dialects or still in a state of transition), from their constant communications with the capital and provinces of the Greek Empire through their clergy, nobles, and merchants (whilst many other nations were living in a state scarcely above that of savages)—it is more than probable that the Russians, had these advantages not all been destroyed by the irruption of Mongols, might have been among the first in learning and in the arts of civilized life, might have been leading and setting example to others, instead of following in their wake. And as a matter of fact, for more than two hundred years Christianity was blooming on Russian soil; but (1) the calamities of internecine wars, and (2) the unspeakable miseries of the awful Tartar invasion had annihilated their first fruits, and for several centuries made any further progress or development utterly impossible. Russia was even yet destined to serve as a protecting wall for the West, and to save the latter from further incursions of barbarians.

1. The system of appanages¹ introduced by Ruric had weakened Russia by unceasing internecine quarrels of princes, who—perfect masters in their own portions—were continually fighting (their quarrels being also not unfrequently fostered by constant attempts on the part of Rome to bring Russia into her subjection) either for their patrimonies or for the title of Grand Duke of Kiev, although it became at last merely nominal. These constant quarrels of two centuries' duration led to no other result than the shattering of their power of defence against a foreign enemy, and involved the princes with their subjects in one general ruin when they were attacked by the Mongols. Throughout their continual internecine wars the Church had to suffer much, and her Metropolitans, being foreigners, could not be expected to do much to stop these feuds.

2. In 1236 the Tartar chief, Batuy, overran Russia with a horde of half a million Asiatic warriors, and in a few years devastated nearly the whole of the then Russian Empire, having burnt cities and villages, put both princes and priests to death, and carried away captive great numbers of citizens and peasants. Russia was compelled to pay tribute and, in return, obtained the privilege of being ruled by her own princes, who for a long time afterwards still continued their mutual feuds, and had to pay dearly for the privilege of ruling; many of them lost their lives and the Grand Ducal dignity was invariably attained only through disgrace and humiliation before the Tartar khans. But the incursions of the latter were so frequently repeated from time to time, and the restored ruins as frequently demolished, that Russians for two centuries had to live in utter uncertainty about their lives and property, mostly in woods and unapproachable forests. The wonder, therefore, rather is that Russia was able to outlive this long period of so severe a probation. To the Church she owes her salvation from utter ruin, and it was the Church that inspired even Tartars with veneration and awe, and brought light into the impenetrable darkness into which Russia was thrown by this invasion.

In the midst of these horrible sufferings, when Russia came to be divided between Yaroslav of Novgorod in the north, and Daniel of Galitch in the south, Rome had instigated against her the Swedes and the Brethren of the Sword. The first were, however, beaten, in 1241, in a bloody

¹ Every male descendant of St. Vladimir, as a member of the reigning family, bore the title of Prince and had a right to an appanage (in the battle of Dnistry Donskoy, 1380, 513 of them were slain). He was the complete and independent ruler of his own portion of territory, had his capital, his own company of followers or army, his own boyars, erected his own towns and fortresses, issued ordinances, had his own courts of judicature, rewarded and punished according to his own discretion, and made war or peace with whom he pleased. The title of the Great Prince belonged to the eldest son of the eldest branch of the appanaged princes, who could compel peace between quarrelling princes and, in case of war with foreign countries, require their assistance against the common enemy, and to be their chief or head of the confederacy, but absolute authority he possessed only in his own appanage, not having any right of interference with their internal government or of receiving any tribute. The result of this system, was a loose kind of league, under one feeble head, of many independent princes who were continually fighting for their own selfish ends, which neither the nobility, the clergy, nor the communities of the towns could have any interest in.

battle on the banks of the Neva (hence the name Alexander Nevsky), and the latter under the walls of Pskoff by the son of Yaroslav, Alexander Nevsky, who also refused in a most decided manner to hear the Papal Legate. Prince Daniel, although he accepted the crown and title of the King of Galitch, put off, however, the proposal for a union of Churches until an œcumenical council; he also selected Cyril, 1250, a Russian, to the dignity of Metropolitan of Kiev, to which he was consecrated by the Patriarch at Nice. There never was a better choice made. This prelate, during fifty years of his administration, by personally going from city to city, repaired and re-edified the Church, and extended her so far as to consecrate a bishop for Saray, the capital of the Golden Horde on the Volga. The khans not only did not include the clergy in the census of the people, but even exempted from all imposts every man "who," to use their own expression, "looketh to the Lord God and serveth God His Churches." Bishop Theognostes of Saray gained the confidence of the khans to such a degree, that the successor of Batuy selected him as his ambassador to the Patriarch of Constantinople. But the most important act of the Metropolitan was the convocation of a synod, in 1274, at Vladimir, the new capital of Russia, for the purpose of restoring the discipline of the Church and correcting the abuses which had crept in from the West, such as mixing of the Holy Chrism with oil, and the practice of affusion instead of trine immersion.—While the yoke of the Mongols was pressing most heavily on Russia, the holy Metropolitan Peter, 1308, was faithful guardian and comforter of his flock. He it was who obtained from the Khan Uzbek the following certificate: "Let no one injure the Catholic Church, the Metropolitan Peter, the archimandrites, or the priests in Russia; let their lands be free from all tax and tribute; for all this belongs to God, and these people by their prayers preserve us; whosoever shall take anything from any of the clergy, let him restore it threefold; whosoever shall speak evil of the Russian Faith, whosoever shall injure any church, monastery, or chapel, let him be put to death." St. Peter also transferred his seat to Moscow, saying: "My bones shall remain in this city, prelates shall rejoice to dwell in it, and the hands of its princes shall be upon the necks of our enemies."—Metropolitan Alexis, 1353, during his primacy of twenty-nine years, had truly taken the helm of the empire, and his sanctity became conspicuous even in the Horde itself, so that the Khan Khanibeck requested him to come that he might heal his consort Taidoula of her sickness. The result of this journey was extraordinary favour shown to the Metropolitan, and new letters of privilege and exemption to the clergy were granted to him. At home St. Alexis had been a strict reformer of the morals both of the clergy and laity, whom he endeavoured to enlighten; he was also a peace-maker between princes, and by him were the foundations of the unification of the empire around Moscow cemented and strengthened.

The desolation produced by the invasion of the Tartars and by their

continual re-incursions, while monasteries had been so much favoured by khans with all kinds of exemptions, had increased the number of monasteries to a very large extent, but with the name of Sergius a new monastic world opens itself in the North. The commencement of his lonely hermitage in the woods near Moscow is a point of as great an importance in the history of Russian Church and state as the excavation of the caves of Antony on the banks of the Dnieper. He, with St. Antony, is the father of monasticism in Russia. Prelates and princes had applied to him not only for spiritual personal instruction, but also to obtain from him teachers trained to perfection by his converse in solitude, and capable of influencing others by their good example. Thus our unhappy country, which had been suffering so long under the Tartar-plague, began to revive again. This St. Sergius, at the very moment of a very decisive battle of Dmitry Donskoy on the field of Koulikovo, 1380, which first shook the empire of the Mongols over Russia, was supporting the prince with his prayer, while his two monks, Peresvet and Osiab, had fought in the ranks, the first beginning the engagement by a single combat with a gigantic Tartar, the champion of the Horde, and being the precursor of those hero-monks of the Trinity Lavra who so gloriously distinguished themselves later on in the days of no less danger and distress to the country.—Metropolitan Cyprian (1390), during eighteen years of his episcopate, had been in the full sense Metropolitan of all Russia, notwithstanding the cruel separation between Lithuania and Moscow, and having gained the affection of all the bishops beyond the Dnieper, and a respect even of Prince Olgerd himself, and his successor Vitovt, had preserved orthodoxy throughout the whole of the southern districts, thus frustrating the designs of Pope Gregory XI., who had already erected four Latin dioceses of Peremyshl, Kholm, Vladimir, and Lvoff. He was instrumental in bringing turbulent Novgorod under the influence of the Prince of Moscow, and left behind him (1407) the lives of SS. Peter and Alexis, his predecessors, as well as a collection of chronicles.—Whilst Russia had been so frequently devastated by the Tartars, the Turks were almost surrounding Constantinople, and the Greek Emperor John, seeing no means of deliverance within his empire, sought for aid from the Western Powers, and Pope Eugenius IV. proposed to him to call a Council in Italy for the reunion of the Churches, promising, if it were agreed to, to save Constantinople from the Turks. The Emperor with the Patriarch and selected clergy sailed for Venice, and Isidor, a friend of the Pope, was sent to Russia as her Metropolitan. He was received both at Kiev and Moscow, but when he so soon after his arrival wanted also to go to Ferrara to attend the Council, the Grand Duke Basil only reluctantly consented, beseeching the Metropolitan to stand firm in defence of the doctrines of orthodoxy. When, however, on his return to Moscow in 1440, he let the acts of the Council of Florence be proclaimed by the archdeacon, Basil called him a traitor to the cause of orthodoxy and a false pastor. The council of bishops and boyars,

with one accord, rejected the Western doctrine, and with the sight of Isidor to Rome terminated yet another attempt to subject Russia to the see of Rome. From 1453, on account of the fall of the Greek Empire, all the Metropolitans had been appointed by a council of Russian bishops, but on all possible opportunities the Patriarchs communicated with the Metropolitans of Russia either by letter or through the bishops sent in person from one to another: from this time also dates their new style "of Metropolitans of all Russia," instead of the former "of Kiev," the latter, under Lithuania, having also begun a regular succession of her own Metropolitans.

With the accession of John III, 1462, almost the whole of Russia proper became united under one sceptre, and the Horde disrupted into three parts; the end of the Tartar yoke over Russia was already looming in the distance. And the Church, whilst continuing to help the state in purification and consolidation of the empire, began to look to the eradication of the evils produced by the dark ages. Metropolitan Theodosius, 1462, raised his voice against the relaxation in the morals of the clergy, in consequence of the great increase of private churches (the end of the world being expected, every one, who had the means, built a church of his own). But yet another attempt on the part of Pope Paul to bring Russia into the subjection of Rome, by means of marriage of John III. with the Princess Sophia, was frustrated, the legate refusing to enter into controversy with the Metropolitan Philip, 1467, on the ground of not having his books with him. It was Vassian, the Bishop of Rostov, and Metropolitan Gerontius, who made John III. return to the camp against Ahmet, the last remnant of the Tartars, the latter having then fled without fighting, and Russia was thus freed from them for ever. "Dost thou dread death?" wrote the bishop. "Thou too must die as well as others; death is the lot of all, man, beast, and bird alike; none can avoid it. Give these warriors to me, and old as I am, I will not spare myself, nor will ever turn my back to the Tartars." A trait, characteristic of Russian bishops, may here be mentioned in connection with the Metropolitan Gerontius (although it is frequently observed both in the previous—notably St. Peter—and later history—particularly Nikon—of Russia). This prelate would rather retire to a monastery to end his days in peace, than continue a misunderstanding with the prince.—Novgorod and Pskoff, situated as they were so far to the north, and having not suffered from the Tartars, had long preceded even the Protestant Reformation with their sects of Strigolnicks (1371) and of Judaisers. While the first rejected hierarchy, and consequently the Church, with all the ceremonies and rites, the latter went further, and may be looked upon as the precursors of Unitarians of our day. In the council of 1494 against the latter, St. Joseph of Volokolamsk—most enlightened and learned man of his time, his convincing and forcible letters being the scourge of the heresy—triumphantly defended the pure and orthodox faith. Yet as a consequence of the dark ages, and notwithstanding the great increase of

monasteries in the reign of Basil, gross errors had crept into the Church itself, and the written books required correction. With this end in view, a learned monk from the monastery of Athos was sent, at the request of the great prince Basil, in 1511, and a beginning of the arrangement of the library of MSS. as well as of correction of books was made. John the Terrible (1547) called a synod of all the bishops, under Macarius in 1551, to correct the errors in the performance of the Divine service, and the following is the affecting speech with which he opened the session :—

"My fathers, pastors, and teachers, see now every one of you what counsel or discernment is in him, and pray God at the same time for His merciful aid. Stir up your understandings, and enlighten yourselves with sound knowledge as to all the divinely inspired ordinances, so as to discern in what way the Lord hath delivered them; and me, your son, enlighten and instruct to *all godliness, as it ought to be with religious kings*, in all righteous laws for the kingdom, in all soundness of faith and purity; and be ye not slack to establish the whole of orthodox Christianity, that we may keep the law of Christ in all its truth, perfect and inviolate. I, for my part, shall always be ready, as with one soul, to join and support you either in correcting what is amiss, or confirming what is well established, according as the Holy Ghost shall show you. If so be that I should ever oppose you, contrary to the letter or spirit of the Divine canons, *do not ye hold your peace at it, but rebuke me; if I shall still be disobedient, inhibit me without any manner of fear; so shall my soul live, and the souls of all my subjects.*"

The council approved also the new statute book of *civil* laws which was submitted for revision. One hundred questions relating to the external and internal discipline of the Church, to the Church courts, the monastic state, the ceremonies, the chant, the icons, the sign of the cross, the correction of the books, the morals of the clergy, the letters of exemption from jurisdiction, the property of the Church, the eradication of many superstitions, etc., were put to the Assembly. The Council of the Hundred Chapters¹ gave a lengthy answer in writing; but, although the text was revised by Josaphat, though the council was presided over by Macarius (author of the eloquent Chetee-Mineyi—Hagiographa), and had for its object the eradication of superstitions and abuses, the prejudices and ignorance of the dark age of John showed themselves in some of the acts of this council. In this way certain superstitious customs and local errors were clothed with the sanction of authority, and, taking root, had produced those pernicious schisms (Raskolniks or Staroviery) with which the Church is even yet affected, while the correction of books was, on account of troubled times, put off until the time of Patriarch Nikon, though some of his predecessors had already made slight advances towards his great work. It is very singular that no original acts had been preserved, no signatures are extant, no chronicles make any mention of this council;

¹ Hence the name by which the Council is known.

even Macarius himself does not say a word about it in his book of genealogies. It must also be mentioned that Archpriest Silvester was the guiding spirit of John at that time. Macarius was the first to establish in Moscow the first printing press, and had caused the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles to be printed ; but the entire Bible in Slavonian, owing to a superstitious prejudice against printing, was printed by the illustrious Prince Constantine of Ostrog, Deputy-governor of Kiev.

When John became mad, after the loss of his gentle consort Anastasia, and when thousands of innocent persons were made victims of his suspicion and rage, St. Philip the Metropolitan (1565), raised the voice of exhortation and rebuke : " For silence," he said, " lays sin upon the soul, and brings death upon the whole people." On another occasion he said : " I do not recognise the Tsar in any such dress ; I do not recognise him either in the acts of his government. . . . Here we are offering up the bloodless sacrifice to the Lord, while behind the altar there is flowing the innocent blood of Christian men." To menaces he replied : " I am a stranger and a pilgrim upon the earth, 'as all my fathers were, and I am ready to suffer for the truth. Where would be my faith if I kept silence ? " Being dragged from the cathedral in a shirt only, " Pray," he called to the people, (not rise up against the anointed one). " I rejoice that I had received all this for the sake of the Church. Alas ! the times of her widowhood are coming, when her shepherds shall be despised as hirelings." A simple hermit offered John at Pskoff a piece of raw flesh. " I am a Christian," said John in astonishment, " and do not eat flesh during the great fast." " At all events thou drinkest man's blood," was the hermit's reply, and John fled from Pskoff without exterminating the city, as otherwise might have been the case.—Politically, however, Russia was greatly extended during this, in its later stage so baneful, reign ; not only the kingdom of Kazan, but the whole of Siberia and Tberia were added to the empire.

It was only after such an extension of her dominions, and after more than a century of complete subjugation of the Eastern patriarchs by the Turks, that Russia sought for and obtained independence of her Church from that of Constantinople. In 1587, with the consent of all the Orthodox Churches in the East, and with the actual participation in consecration on the part of Jeremia II. of Constantinople, the Metropolitan Job of Moscow was elevated to the dignity and received the title of Patriarch of Russia ; but this did not change matters internally, the new Patriarch remaining in exactly the same position with regard to other bishops as when he was their Metropolitan ; only the independence of the Russian Church was thus proclaimed, and the event may have been providentially instrumental during the succeeding quarter of a century in preserving the unity and independence of the Russian state.

Rome, who had always kept her watchful eye on Russia for an opportunity of subjugating this rising stronghold of orthodoxy, and had the Jesuit Antony Possevin accredited for several years as her special ambassador at

the court of John the Terrible during the worst part of his life, although still without success, had now undertaken the most determined attempt to carry out her design. Little Russia, now entirely separated from Great Russia and under Lithuanians, had proved, already in the hands of the wily Jesuit (as he was going to and fro), to be of a more pliable stuff than the Great Russians, and the seed of discord sown by him and watered by a whole army of Dominicans who invaded the country, seemed likely soon to bear the fruit. It required only a little, usual for Rome, pressure in the shape of deprivation of property and all civil rights, of some deaths by torture and fire, to make the fruit ripe for the harvest which in 1596 produced the Church of Uniates. Of these nothing was at first demanded but the recognition of the papal power; yet against their return, of their own free will, to the pale of the Orthodox Church, after more than two centuries of forcible subjugation to the Church of Rome, first in 1839 and again in the reign of the late Emperor Alexander II.—incapable of any coercion—such an outcry had been raised in the West. But even in Little Russia there remained a large, faithful band of the orthodox, who were supported by such champions as Bishops Gedeon and Michael, and the aged Prince Constantine of Ostrog, and who had struggled to the bitter end against overwhelming odds and all kinds of persecutions.—Having established such a firm footing in the south, Rome attempted again to submit to herself Great Russia also. With this end in view, the vacant throne of Poland was offered to Tsar Theodor; but he who had just made the Russian Church independent, by elevating Metropolitan Job to be the Patriarch of Moscow, could not of course be induced to relinquish the faith of his fathers. Peaceful and overt means having failed, others, more jesuitical, were had recourse to, and the circumstances favoured these plans. The greatest calamity of Tsar Theodor's reign was the murder of his brother Dmitry, the last descendant, after six centuries, of the Ruric's dynasty. When, therefore, in 1598, Tsar Theodor himself died childless, there arose an interregnum which lasted until, in 1613, the present dynasty, that of Romanoff, was proclaimed in the person of Michael, who was distantly related to the Ruric's house, on which account also both his father and mother were interred in monasteries by the ambitious Boris Godounoff, brother-in-law of the late Tsar and his successor, to whose charge the murder of Dmitry is laid.—Already, soon after Boris's accession, rumour was spread that Dmitry was still alive, and a person of the name of Otrepieff, who resembled the murdered child, was discovered by Jesuits, and, supported by the arms of Poland, he succeeded in reaching Moscow and getting possession of the throne of the Tsars. When this pretender lost his life on account of his attempts to introduce the Latin faith, another and a third were substituted. In this way the state had become completely disorganized, but again, thanks to the Church and the people at large, the state came out victorious and independent, and the orthodox faith remained unimpaired. When assailed by miscreants in the cathedral during

liturgy, and his pontifical robes were torn from him, the Patriarch Job, laying his Panagia on the icon of the Holy Virgin, exclaimed: "For twenty-nine years have I preserved the purity of the faith; I now see that misery is coming upon the kingdom, that fraud and heresy are to triumph. O Mother of God, do thou preserve the orthodox faith!" His successor, Hermoghen, being requested by Saltikoff to forbid the general rising against the Poles, who now wanted their king's son to become the Tsar of Russia, replied: "I will forbid it when I see Vladislav baptized, and the Poles evacuating the country; if this is not to be, I enjoin on all to rise, and absolve them from their oath to the king's son." "I oppose this sign (of the cross) against thy (Saltikoff's, who lifted his dagger against the old man) audacity. All will be quiet, if thou, O traitor, will only remove thyself with thy Lithuanians. As for me, I give my blessing to all who are ready to die for the orthodox faith, for I see it insulted."

Troitskaya (Trinity) Lavra for eighteen months withstood the siege of the Poles, and to the offer of protection from Sweden, the Hegumen Antony replied: "No stranger should ever be the Tsar of Russia;" and that "the Lavra stood in no need of his (the king of Sweden's) soldiers." In the meantime the Solovetskya Lavra opposed the Swedish army in the north. Archimandrite Dionysius of the Troitskaya Lavra took care of the people who fled from the capital, turned the whole convent into an hospital for the sufferers, and sent out letters in all directions urging co-operation with the general rising, and gave supplies to those who were besieging Moscow. At Nijni-Novgorod the spark of pure self-devotion broke out in the heart of a citizen Minin, whose example was responded to by the whole nation. Under the command of Prince Pojarsky was concentrated the military force which was destined to free the country. The unceasing entreaties of the Hegumen Dionysius and Abram the Bursar moved the prince to disregard danger under the walls of Moscow. Abram was himself constantly with the armies, and was not less active and efficient a leader than Prince Pojarsky and citizen Minin. The synod and the council, which were called together for the purpose of electing a new sovereign, spoke as one man for Michael Romanoff; the Bursar announced the election to the people from the public place, and the people also, as with one voice, echoed the same name. Letters statutory of the whole synod of the clergy and of the council put seal to the election of the Romanoffs, by establishing for ever the right of a hereditary autocracy. The Emperor of Russia is, therefore, an elect of the people and their representative.

Even a worm is said to turn against its tormentors, and after all these incursions of foreigners, Russia could not but feel sick of everything outlandish, and stick to her old traditions and ways. At the same time the worse than iron yoke of over two centuries' duration, left much more lamentable consequences and a deeper impress, in the general ignorance. Thus, on the one hand we find a continuous, almost uninterrupted call of foreigners, long before Peter the Great, and even the Romanoff dynasty

could be dreamed of, on the part of the rulers ; yet, on the other, we discover still greater tendency to conservatism, to the preservation of old national forms, habits and customs, even in their worst state and condition. It is difficult to realize to what extent of anarchy and disorganization the Russian state had been reduced by the frightful interregnum and the invasion of the Poles, who, for some ten years, were almost complete masters of the land. Truly, by Russia's faith only is our state free and stable ; but for the Church and people's faith there would not have remained a vestige of the kingdom of the Tsars. No wonder, therefore, that Russia, on the one hand, should have found herself, on account of the almost continually disturbed state, in a great spiritual darkness, and, on the other, should have conceived an utter dislike to all foreign influences. The latter we shall see in the dislike against Nikon, and the opposition with which Peter the Great had had to deal ; the first, in the gross errors which had long crept, not only into the MSS., but also into the books printed under Patriarchs Job and Hermoghen, and both combined in the Staroveri (Old Believers) of the present day.

Now that peace and organization were being, by slow degrees, re-established, the Church again turned her attention to the correction of errors in the service-books. Dionysius, with his brotherhood of the Troitskaya Lavra, undertook the task by comparing the latter with the manuscripts brought by the learned Greek, Maximus, and with the others which were preserved in the Lavra. But when he decided to leave out the words "by fire," in the office for the blessing of waters, there arose a great agitation, as the people absurdly imagined and accused him of a device to extirpate the element of fire from the land. Only the presence of Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who happened to be on a visit at the time, brought peace to the Church. He prevailed on the father of the Tsar, Metropolitan Philaret, who for nine years had been kept in captivity in Poland, and elevated him to the dignity of Patriarch of Moscow, thus bringing about an event unique in the annals of the world : in no country has there ever been seen that a father as patriarch and his son as sovereign were governing the kingdom together. The same Theophanes had also done much for the Orthodox Church in Little Russia. On his return from Moscow, he stopped at Kiev and gave to the Brotherhood of the Epiphany there his benediction for the institution of a school for the Greco-Slavonic and the Latin-Polish languages, and of an academical inn for poor scholars. He, too, restored all the vacant dioceses by consecrating a Metropolitan for Kiev, and bishops for the sees of Polotsk, Vladimir in Volhynia, Loutsk, Peremyshl, Kholm and Pinsk.

This good beginning with the education and the hierarchy was soon taken up and carried to a very high state of perfection by Peter Mogila. A son of the Hospodar of Moldavia, educated in the celebrated University of Paris, and a distinguished soldier, he settled later in the Petcherskaya Lavra, and from thence he began to send forth some chosen students to foreign

countries to complete their education. He showed himself a powerful defender of orthodoxy in the Diet of Warsaw, and obtained from the new king the restoration of many churches, convents, and properties, as well as the freedom to establish seminaries, schools, and printing presses. Having been elected, in 1632, Metropolitan of Kiev, he yet with greater zeal devoted himself to the promotion of learning among the clergy, united his school with that of the Brotherhood of the Epiphany, erected new buildings at his own expense, and a preparatory school, established a library and a printing press, and obtained from the king for his school the title of Spiritual Academy, which for a long time had been known as the Kiev-Mogolian, served as model for those which were established later in Great Russia, and exists at the present day. From his printing press he was constantly sending forth works of the holy fathers, and books of services of the Church, and his larger Trebnik or office-book became the model for the performance of the orthodox service; but the most important act for the confirmation of his distracted flock had been the Orthodox Confession of Faith, written partly by himself and partly by the Archimandrite Isaia, Trophimovitch, under his direction. Revised by the council of bishops, the book which was to counteract the subtle discourses of the Jesuits, as well as the new doctrine of Calvin, which had been sown under the name of Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, was translated into the modern Greek, finally corrected by Meletius Striga at the Synod of Yassi, and returned to Kiev by the Eastern patriarchs with their letters of approval, after the death (1647) of the celebrated Metropolitan. Favourable as this period of the history of Little Russia had been for the improvement of clerical learning, the sufferings of the orthodox there from the civil power were intense, notwithstanding the benevolent views of the king, and the Great Russia herself was too weak at the time to come to the rescue of the Cosaks who would not be induced to Latinize themselves, but who in vain appealed to her for protection.

The Great Russia, in the meantime, was too busy with healing the deep wounds inflicted on her by the foreign invasion, and could not, in her unsettled state, do much for the advancement of learning. The first part of the reign of the Tsar Alexis (1646), which lasted for sixteen years, recalled to mind the troubled beginning of his father's. In his inexperienced youth he had been led by his Boyars at their will. One of the lasting memorials of this time, however, was the codification of laws; but still more remarkable was the appearance of Patriarch Nikon, a most able and distinguished man, of whom history has not yet said her last word. Born of simple villagers, he, in his very youth, wanted to devote himself to monasticism, and throughout his life of threescore and ten, remained an ascetic in his habits; but his noble height and bearing, coupled with extraordinary eloquence, struck the Tsar (at an accidental meeting), who found in him a great zeal for the Church, and the loftiest views, not only of ecclesiastical, but of political matters also, and, having made him archimandrite of the

Novospafsky monastery, accustomed himself to be guided by his sage counsels. As Metropolitan of Novgorod, to which post he was appointed after three years' stay in Moscow, when he every Friday came regularly to converse with the Tsar, he had proved that the confidence placed in, and the unusual authority granted, him (namely that of judging even in civil matters affecting persons connected with the Church, and of entering prisons and releasing the innocent on personal examination), were completely justified. During the great famine which devastated Novgorod, Nikon had four alms-houses built, daily fed the poor in his own court-yard, and, in the midst of a dreadful insurrection, whilst in Pskoff the irritated populace put to death their governors (voivodes),—in Novgorod, the Metropolitan went out himself to the insurgents, suffered blows until scarcely any breath was left in him, was not afraid to appear afterwards in the very building where the rebels were assembled, and, by his immovable firmness, succeeded at last in quieting the storm, people in penitence coming to him for spiritual absolution and for the pardon of the Tsar.

His pastoral zeal for the morals of the clergy and flock, and for the magnificence of the church was carried to the highest pitch: himself an eloquent and fluent extempore preacher, and a great lover of order, cleanliness, and magnificence, he absolutely forbade the habit of allowing intoning and singing to run together, and introduced a sweeter kind of chant. An austere man himself, he would not suffer on any account looseness of morals among his clergy, and severely punished the offenders. Thus, while he was supported in all his measures by the Tsar, who insisted on his spending every winter in Moscow, and made local edicts of the Metropolitan into general law throughout his dominions, the aged Patriarch Joseph regarded him with disfavour, and overlooked the greatest abuses admitted by Nikon's enemies in printing the Psalter, *Kormchaya* (Nomocanon), and the Catechism. In the meantime the unavoidable necessity of correcting the Church books became so evident, and want of education so much felt, that the Tsar begged the Metropolitan of Kiev to send him some monks from the illustrious academy. A pious and learned Boyar, Rtischeff, founded near Moscow a convent (the germ of the present academy) for learned monks from Little Russia, for the translation of ecclesiastical works. Arseny Soukhanoff, not well disposed towards the Greeks, was dispatched to the East to observe on the spot how the rule of the Church was followed by the four Œcumenical Thrones, and the enemies of Nikon found in the description of the journey of the Bursar sufficient material to rise in opposition to the Metropolitan, whom they accused of a desire to conform in everything with the Greek Church. Nikon, therefore, at first positively refused to become patriarch, and it was only after the Tsar, with all the council and synod, before the relics of St. Philip, which were just brought to Moscow by Nikon, abjured him not to leave the Church in widowhood, and after they all swore that they "would always honour him as their true chief shepherd and spiritual pas-

tor, and would suffer him to regulate the affairs of the Church," that he at last declared his consent to undertake the high office. The genius and enterprising character of the prelate inspired the councils of the Tsar, and were reflected in the glory of his victories over the neighbouring powers, so that the six years of the patriarchal rule of Nikon formed the most brilliant period of his reign. The Tsar and patriarch became so mutually attached to one another that they made a vow never to desert each other on this side the grave. The Patriarch's attachment to the Tsar and his children, to whom he was godfather, knew indeed no bounds, and the courtiers who at last succeeded in encompassing his downfall, dreaded nothing so much as the chance of his personal meeting with the Tsar, whose tender friendship for the patriarch never left him to the day of his death.

Shocked at discovering gross errors introduced into the recently printed books, by their ignorant and unprincipled editors, Nikon entreated the Tsar to convoke a council in his palace, and obtained the following reply to his proposition from the synod: "It is meet and right to correct the new books by the old Slavonic and Greek MSS., that we may in all things follow the primitive rule of the Church." It was decided to collect not only all the MSS. preserved in Russia, but to apply to the Churches of the East for their judgment and decision. Paisius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, confirmed by a synodal act of Greek bishops the decision of the Council of Moscow, and in his letter to Nikon, whilst entreating him not to depart in any respect from the rule of the great Church of Constantinople, that the five patriarchal thrones should be one, not only in doctrines and discipline, but also in their very ceremonies and rites, and whilst applauding his zeal, he begged him to be indulgent to those who had erred in some unimportant external matters only, that so he might retain them within the pale of the Church. The arrival in Moscow of the Patriarchs, Macarius of Antioch, and Gabriel of Servia, gave Nikon an opportunity for holding another council for the sake of adding still greater authority to the projected undertaking. Upon this decided steps were taken to effect the necessary correction; but there had been no such prudence observed in the introduction of the new books throughout the country, and, when the old books began to be taken forcibly away, there immediately arose a murmuring among the people; and the old enemies of Nikon imposed on the ignorance of the populace by calling the corrected, "new" books, and, as such, representing them to be unworthy of any respect. Thus did a most excellent and useful undertaking become the cause of unexpected disturbances.

The courtiers,—who were curiously treated by the patriarch, and made to feel his superiority over them, particularly during the two years' absence of the Tsar from the capital on a military expedition, when Nikon presided over their council standing, or made them wait at his door for several hours, if any came a little later than the appointed hour,—could

not bear him. And the clergy, of whom he—the strict pattern of good conduct in every station of life—exacted the same with equal rigidity, punishing intemperance, and every violation of ecclesiastical order, with stripes and imprisonment (depriving even a bishop on his sole authority), and whom he never ordained before personally examining the candidates at least in reading and writing, did not appreciate him. They both united in a general outcry against the self-willed absolutism of the patriarch. And the latter,—when his only real friend, the Tsar, discontinued his daily intercourse and private consultations with him, and set aside some of his ecclesiastical dispositions, and when the Council of the Boyars dared to act with greater decision in the monastery court, and to raise questions about Church properties acquired since the edicts of John III. to the contrary,—began to meditate his own retirement. He could not stand the insolence and railleries of the Boyars against himself and his attendants, and at last, in 1658, he took off his episcopal robes, and declared in the cathedral that from thenceforth he was no longer the Patriarch of Moscow. He was exhorted to remain by a Boyar from the Tsar, but stood inflexible, and left Moscow for a not distant monastery built by himself. It is unnecessary to dwell on the protracted trial which, with participation of Eastern patriarchs, followed—his deposition and banishment to Belo-Ozero. In close confinement he outlived three other patriarchs, and the Tsar Alexis himself,—who had continually sent him presents and alms, and in his will called him “Father, great lord, most holy pontiff, and most blessed pastor,”—and was allowed to return to the Monastery of Resurrection, by the Tsar Theodor, only to die on the road. One thing is certain, that Nikon presents an entirely new figure even in the Russian history. With such extraordinary talents, iron will, and inflexible, though hasty character which he possessed, he might, had he been a Western ecclesiastic, have conceived the idea of an entire independence of the Church from the state, even of the dominion of the first over the latter; but no such thought had ever crossed his mind, and from youth to his death he remained a Christian and a dutiful subject.

The same council, which was not far short of being œcumenical, and which sat over and condemned Nikon for his arbitrary acts, confirmed, however, his correction of books as perfectly canonical and agreeable to the spirit of the Orthodox Church. It rejected and condemned the vain glosses of the chief supporters of the old books respecting the position of the fingers, the correct form of the cross, the name of Jesus, the creed, the double alleluia, and their objections to the Book of Skrijal or Table, which had been put forth by his authority. A new book, “The Staff of Rule,” printed for the purpose of refutation of their errors, was approved by this council, which also annulled the acts of the Council of the Hundred Chapters, that gave rise to all the vain subtleties in question, but all this was to no purpose.¹ The anathematized adherents of these, so called, old ways

¹ In the reign of the humane Catherine II., by Platon, the great Metropolitan of Moscow, and author of the History of the Russian Church and of the Orthodox Catechism, was

of teaching had spread in all directions, but more particularly in the north, where Solovetskaya Lavra had been kept by them for over ten years, and where, on account of their settling themselves along the coast, they were called Pomoriane, *alias* Bezpopovtsy, viz., without hierarchy, and in Little Russia, in the settlement of Starodoubovo, and in the neighbouring districts of Poland on the river Vetka, these being known under the denomination of Popovtsy, viz., acknowledging only the runaway (from the Orthodox Church) priests. Both are the products of ignorance, and are still depending upon it; but for both, Nikon and Peter the Great with his reforms and the title of the emperor, remain up to the present day as the very incarnations of the evil one, the Antichrists.

Now the Church had in all earnest began to advance the learning. The brothers Joannicius and Sophronius Lichoudy,—who were sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople for the school founded at Moscow by Philaret and enlarged and remodelled by Nikon,—established the Slaviano-Greco-Russian Academy, which, in a reformed state, still exists, and Patriarch Joachim had done much by increasing the number of schools throughout the empire. He reunited the Church of Little Russia, and contemplated even the establishment of as many as fifty new episcopal sees, either territorial or vicarial; but the death of Tsar Theodor, and consequent disorder and agitation into which Russia had again been plunged, prevented for a time the realization of the project. A fresh remodelling of the state and Church on the Western sample was at the very door. Peter the Great was growing up and getting rid of the trammels set before him by his sisters (especially Sophia), his first wife Eudoxia, and his own son and heir, Alexis, whose death-warrant he himself signed.

With his insatiable thirst for knowledge, and with a spirit which knew no fatigue, he could not bear the rather slow progress which Russia was making before his time. Great as were his achievements in bringing Russia to the Baltic, creating a fleet and an army, establishing schools and generally promoting advancement in every station and department of public life, it cannot be denied that "the window to the West" was opened by him a little too wide; that Russia could not follow the impetuous leader with anything like his gigantic strides; and that, consequently, the reforms of foreign growth, transplanted by him from foreign soils, could touch Russia but very superficially. The beards and coats were certainly cut, but Russians could not help being rather slow in their progress and movements generally. Such a man could not of course be expected to run the risk of meeting face to face with another imaginable Nikon, and the Russian Patriarchate was doomed from the very moment the feeble Adrian X., and the last of the series, gave up his ghost at the end of 1700; but it was conceived, and, under Emperor Nicolas, carried out the idea of opening the door into the pale of the Church to these schismatics, by founding churches in which the duly consecrated priests perform the services by the same old books and with exactly the same ceremonies and rites as are therein prescribed, there being no difference of dogma involved. But the measure had not much success.

not until 1721 that the "Most Holy Governing Synod" was instituted and declared to be the substitute for the late patriarchate, the worthy Metropolitan Stephen (author of a very respectable polemical work, "The Rock of Faith") with the title of Guardian, carrying on the government of the Church in the meanwhile. "The Spiritual Regulation" (the product of Theophan Prokopovitch, Bishop of Pskoff, and author of a treatise on theology) for the guidance of the synod, containing, in three parts, an accurate statement of the composition and object of this collegiate government, and approved of by the Eastern patriarchs just as the substitution itself of the patriarchate by the synod,—remains, with but few modifications, still in force.¹ Both the seminaries at every episcopal seat, and the Ecclesiastical Academy at St. Petersburg, contemplated under it, are now in a flourishing state; but the number of foreigners that invaded Russia at Peter's bidding, with their totally different views of religion and life, the strange customs and habits alien to the Russian spirit, although they could not supplant the spirit of orthodoxy or Russian nationality, both so near and dear to the heart of every Russian, could not help greatly retarding their growth and development. The model Western schools became the hotbeds of the mediæval scholasticism in its worst form, the very language in them being Latin down to some fifty years ago, and they produced celebrated dialecticians and linguists, but very few orthodox theologians.² Frequent changes of rulers, with foreigners as regents or favourites, could not be conducive to the advancement of national education. In the same category must of course be placed the awful invasion of Russia in 1812, by Napoleon I. with his barbaric hordes; but calling up the national upheaval, it raised the spirit of nationality, just as the Crimean coalition, and proved

¹ Three Metropolitans and the Archbishop of Georgia usually attend the sittings of the synod, he of St. Petersburg being the president. Other members are selected by the *ex-officio* members, and an imperial ukaze calls them to attend. The titles of Metropolitans and Archbishops are merely nominal and honorary, all the bishops being exactly equal in their privileges and rights. Three names of candidates for bishoprics are submitted to the Emperor by the synod, and His Majesty generally consults the *Uler-Procurore*—the legal adviser of the synod and their intermediary with the Emperor—as to whom of the three the synod particularly had in view. The bishops in Russia had always, as in the East from time immemorial, been monks, and are selected from those who had received the highest education, and had proved their pastoral abilities as archimandrites of great monasteries, at the same time chiefs of educational establishments, or from the distinguished widowed archpriests. The parish priests must either marry before consecration, or remain for ever single, without taking the vows. From the time of Catherine II., when, in conformity to the plan of Peter the Great, all the land is with serfs on them were taken from the monasteries, both the black and the white clergy yearly receive certain small stipends (from £10), the white, besides the fees from the parishioners, having also glebe lands which they usually cultivate themselves.

² The exceptions are truly the very gems of their kind, and their writings are translated into almost all the European languages. Such are Plato's Catechism and History, Philaret's, also of Moscow, the "Great Catechism" and the selected sermons; Philaret's of Tchernigoff "Dogmatic Theology;" but especially Macarius, late Metropolitan of Moscow, whose "Fundamental Theology and Dogmatic Theology" are well known abroad, and whose "History of the Russian Church" (a very voluminous work) will also before long be translated and become known abroad. The Russian Church had, and can now boast of, several remarkable preachers. The late Nicanor of Odessa and the present Ambrosius of Kharkoff may be cited as examples.

once more to the new Crusaders of the West how great is the Russian God, and how strong the faith of the people (even the almost Frenchified upper classes of the time began to speak and think in Russian).

It is only at the time of such a patriot as was Emperor Nicolas I. that Chomiakoffs, Aksakoffs, Samarins, and Kireeffs could appear, and be enabled to thoroughly grasp, duly appreciate, and intelligibly inculcate to others, the superiority of the orthodoxy over the Western forms of Christianity, and its congeniality with the spirit of the Slavonian races; but these great masters, as all other prophets, for a long time remained unrecognised, and are still reviled and abused abroad under the bugbear name of Panславists. Now their writings are widely known in Russia, and the saintly Chomiakoff is being laid at the very foundation of the study of orthodox theology.

With the commencement of the late gentle reign (which will for ever remain memorable, both for the greatest act of humanity in the liberation of millions of serfs and other beneficial reforms, as well as for diabolical attempts, under the influence of foreign ideas, on the life of the anointed) there was a great revival of the missionary spirit in Russia, and while she had never before crossed the borders of her state, confining her work among the newly acquired peoples or races, there left for Japan, besides several parties that went to Siberia, a single young monk. It was the present Bishop Nicolay, and his truly apostolic labours have been crowned with a very great success, there being now no less than 16,000 native orthodox Christians, a small separate Church, the youngest daughter, who so eloquently greeted the mother Church on the occasion of the 900th anniversary, with which we have begun the present lecture.

From the preceding, necessarily rapid, survey it appears:—

1. That throughout these nine centuries the Russian Church had almost uninterruptedly had to struggle against the encroachments and persecutions of the Church of Rome, who did her utmost and by all available means in her power to get mastery over the Orthodox Church.
2. That, in spite of all the sufferings and adverse political and social conditions, the Russian Church had throughout preserved the faith as she received it from the beginning, and her closest union with the Churches of the East, having, for six centuries, remained a dutiful daughter of that of Constantinople, and, in the persons of her own patriarchs as well as later on in the holy synod, independent and equal to the other Orthodox Churches and Patriarchates of the East.
3. That she continued steadfastly to proceed hand in hand with the civil government, fashioning and influencing it, but never encroaching on the rights of Cæsars, and herself ever remaining, in matters of dogma, her own mistress and independent judge, not having experienced any infraction in essentially religious matters on the part of the civil power.
4. That, having firmly established Christian principles and piety in her

children, and finding herself in the midst of awakening of the truly national and Christian spirit and animation, she now strives to heal the wounds of centuries of darkness by enlightening the slaves of letter and of an alien spirit.

5. That, having by very slow, it may be, but sure steps, continued to spread the light of Christianity in the ever widening limits of the empire, not by sword or persecution, but by spiritual means of education and piety, she, in her flourishing mission to Japan, begins to extend her beneficent influence beyond those confines.

May she continue in this progress, and, by making the banner of orthodoxy shine forth afar, be the means of uniting the whole of mankind into the one flock and fold of Christ.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.¹

BY B. F. C. COSTELLOE, M.A.

"THROUGH all the centuries of civilization"—so I imagine Macaulay's New Zealander will say to an impartial generation—"through all the change and chance of History there runs one permanent power. Alike in the decay of Greece and the pride of Rome, alike through the tempest of the barbarian times and the gradual uprising of the kingdoms, from the ages when men accepted meekly their appointed place, to the latter day when every man's hand was against his brother in the bitter war of individual competition, one system of things has stood secure, as a castle founded upon a rock stands above the rising and the falling tide, through the calm weather and the storm.

"An organization at first but of the unlearned and the outcasts of society—as was its Founder—placed under the ban of the most imperial despotism the world has seen, it was a little later the sister sovereign of that same Empire throughout the Roman world; and when the Empire fell beneath the greatness of its task, the throne of the Fisherman continued to stand in the very palace of the Cæsars, and the city where the Popes of four centuries had been driven like things of darkness underground became the world-capital of the Papacy.

"In one age the apostle of an ideal morality in an evil time; in another the conservator of learning; in a third the mother of the Arts; in all, the pattern and helper of political and social unity—this unchanging yet ever-varying kingdom, this stern and yet most liberal philosophy, not only claimed to teach, but taught, as with authority, the children of men."

Surely I may claim, my friends, that it is a startling item in the secular march of things, a masterful fact not lightly to be put by—no more than that other cardinal fact to which it leads us back—the life and death of Jesus who was called the Christ. He founded this power, He said it should not fail; and it has not failed.

Not once, but many times, indeed, there came great waves of what the world thought disaster. In the beginning it was persecution. Edict after edict went out against them, till in the darkest of the night before the dawn an illiterate barbarian bent the force of the twin Empires to exterminate the Christian name: and knowing how easy was the detection of those who never would deny their crime, the imperial statesman said that the

¹ This address has already been printed as a separate tract, by the Catholic Truth Society.

dangerous rival of the Cæsars would not be heard of any more—but it is the statesmen who are forgotten.

Then there was the wave of Schism. The Arian heresy prevailed so far that men said the Church's time was ended upon the earth. Princes and peoples, Bishops and provinces, fell away, till there was but a handful left to continue the great tradition. Yet in a little while the Arians passed like a mirage, and men asked each other the meaning of the name.

It was an even darker hour, when a rising tide of moral corruption and a swift outbreak of intellectual doubt coinciding in the period of the Renaissance seemed to have killed the energies of the Church, and swamped in wickedness and infidelity the very Court of Rome. Yet the curious reasonings of the Neo-Pagans have left but faint echoes in the history of thought—the worldly Popes and the corrupt Cardinals and all the unfaithful stewards who dared to lift their mitres up against their Master have gone to their account—and there does not remain upon the institutions or the morals or the doctrine of the Church a vestige of the evil time.

Wave upon wave, in the very worst of the danger, came the great upheaval called the Reformation, wherein the spirit of Individualism, personified in the rough violence of Luther, rent the Church in twain; and in this rebellion and the disorders which accompanied and followed it, it seemed as if the bark of Peter must assuredly go down. Yet as even Macaulay—most typical of English Protestants—has borne witness, the work of the Council of Trent and the early labours of the Jesuit Order and all that inner Reformation which accompanied these, left the Papacy not weaker but stronger than before.

Finally, in our time, are come the days when countless new chapters of revelation are unrolled by science, and when a universal criticism, laying faith and reverence aside, has summoned every creed and every law to answer at the bar of reason for its right to be. All these great and good men who are to free us from the trammels of old time—whether they come as agnostics or in the name of evolution, whether they say they hold God needless, or have found our immortality to be a phantom, or cannot recognise that there is such a thing as sin—with one accord in divers tongues cry out to us that the old creeds have passed for ever, and that the religion of the future, if religion there be at all, must be something less archaic than the Church of Christ. But in the midst of them—not denying whatever truth they have to show, adapting indeed the message of the ages to the later time, but upholding always her profession of Christ's teaching and the Christian Law—the ancient Church goes on.

It is in this permanence amid the changing centuries, it is in this enduring triumph in defeat, that even the most hostile critics have felt something of that great appeal which to her children the mere existence of the Church implies; and something of the force with which to their eyes is realized in her the prophecy of the Divine Founder. May we not well

call it a fulfilment of that commission, with which, in different wordings, it pleased the Spirit that inspired the writers of the covenant to close three Gospels and to begin the Acts: "As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you: go ye therefore into all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you always, even to the end of the world"?

It is in this light, then, that I desire first to present to you the mission and office of the Catholic Church. Its name insists upon its universal claim. It is not a congregation of persons agreeing together; it is not a School of Philosophy; it is not a Mutual Improvement Society. It is not even a Church among other Churches. It is *the* Church Universal—the Living Voice of God, in Christ's revelation, unto all people, through all time. It is for this reason, and this only, that it teaches as its Master taught,—not as the Scribes and Pharisees, but as one "having authority." It is for this reason that in God's name it makes that awful demand upon the faith of men which no human power, however arrogant, would dare suggest—that we who accept its teaching office shall accept those propositions which are "of faith," even where we do not wholly understand them, and even where they may seem to us to stand in conflict with other portions of our personal reasoning as to the things that lie within the human ken.

You will see at once that this demand cannot merely be waived aside as being incompatible with so-called rights of private judgment, unless you are prepared on the same principle to deny that there can be any authoritative revelation of God's truth at all.

Private judgment—meaning the paramount authority of that which at any moment may commend itself to me—must dissolve any Divine authority of the Written Word, as surely as of the Living Voice. Luther, in his more consistent mood, was hardly less arrogant than Mr. Matthew Arnold in his assertion that the Canon of the New Testament was to be limited by his own theology. The Epistle of James, said Luther, cannot be the Word of God, because it is tainted with "Justification by works." This and this cannot be a λόγιον of Jesus, says the modern critic, because I would not have said it.

I do not forget that one great watchword of the sixteenth century revolt was the appeal from the Church to the Bible. But the impartial critics have long since begun to recognise that the Bible is no ally of the Lutheran and Calvinist theology, much less of the eclectic system of the so-called National Church of England. And as the inevitable disintegration has gone on, the appeal to the Bible has come to be an appeal against the Bible.

I do not hesitate, indeed, to say that the teaching office of the Church and the existence of any real revelation must stand and fall together. If there be no Church, neither is there any Bible, unless you mean by a

Bible an interesting but scrappy compendium of Oriental literature. If the Church be not a teacher, then there is not any Christ at all, unless it be a self-deluded Hebrew Socrates.

It will enable me to make my position clearer, if I may for a moment assume that those whom I address accept the proposition that the mission of Christ was to reveal to the whole world some knowledge of Divine things not attainable or not attained before. My position is that, if this be true, the claim of the Church to be a living voice, expounding with authority from age to age what was contained in that revelation and included in the deposit of faith, must of necessity be allowed. For if a revelation *was* required for the spiritual guidance of the race, it is self-evident that the truth intended to be revealed must be capable of being apprehended by all sorts and conditions of men, and in the coming ages of the world, with some reasonable security. A revelation which in its cardinal points was open to such absolute doubt, that the most honest, enlightened and spiritual men could arrive at conclusions diametrically opposed, and yet have no kind of arbiter to whom they could refer their difference, is no revelation at all. That any revelation should be useful for the world or conceivable as a providential design, three things surely are necessary: that it should be guaranteed in its inception; that it should carry a continuing certitude; and that it should be applicable to the intelligence and practical necessities of every struggling soul. It is written, indeed, that the things of God are hidden oftentimes from the wise and learned, and are revealed rather to the babes and sucklings of the world. But assuredly it *cannot* be true that the revelation of Christ is a thing discernible by sundry scholars and gentlemen, having leisure and much knowledge, but wholly misapprehended or not visible at all among the "little ones" of whom He always spoke so carefully,—by the crossing-sweeper and the washerwoman, the labourer in the fields, the proletariat of the town. If from these, who need it most, the revelation of Christ is inevitably hidden, then God has mocked the universe. But if there be *not* a teaching authority and a living voice, how is the truth accessible to these?

Will you tell me they can read a Bible? I reply, that men better and more learned than they have found a thousand contradictory religions within the covers of the Sacred Books of Christianity. Even if it were not so, who shall guarantee to them either the degree of authority that attaches to these books or even the contents of the canon, if there be no continuing teacher in the world since the day when Christ last stood on Olivet, when not a line indeed of the New Testament was written?

The movers of the revolt against authority in the sixteenth century felt the difficulty dimly; but they evidently were not aware of the far-reaching scepticism which their protest logically involved. They adopted, as a working principle, the doctrine of the infallibility of Bible texts, supplemented by the conception of the "testimony of the Holy Spirit." On

this view, earnest souls throughout Protestantism, prayerfully reading the Word of God with the intoxicating belief in a personal revelation of its import, were not long in setting up an infinite diversity of creed and practice; wherein for want of any pope, each teacher was his own. Even the monstrosities of the Anabaptists in the earlier time, or of the Mormons in our own, have come to them guaranteed by the same authority which guarantees the sturdy Calvinism of Scotland, the Puritanism of the Ironsides, the mystic spirituality of George Fox and William Penn. Of all this I merely say that, to my mind, such a revelation reveals nothing; and that if the office of the Messiah were but to live and speak for a little while, and charge a few uneducated persons to commit to writing a fragmentary account of what He did and said, and a still more imperfect set of epistolary remarks upon the theories of life and action which He taught, then He has left the world without any secure guidance in the ways of God, or any safe criterion of truth and right.

Surely the cult of isolated texts which is nicknamed "Bibliolatry" is no possible assurance of God's teaching. There are texts which, taken apart, prove almost everything. And conversely there are many vital matters which no set of texts, taken apart, will satisfactorily establish. If anything is clear about the New Testament, it is that nowhere does it profess to set out either a reasoned philosophy of life or a comprehensive scheme of doctrine. Apart from the patent circumstance, that the "Discipline of the Secret" precluded the publication of what may be called the esoteric dogmas of the early Christians, it is obvious that in no one of the Gospels or Epistles has the writer any idea of writing a systematic exposition, or any notion that he is putting on record an exhaustive or complete account of the teaching either of Christ or of the early Church. To them, as to me, the deposit of faith was a body of tradition, providentially safeguarded by the earthly work of the Spirit of Truth, but not depending on nor bounded by the Sacred Books, for it was going on concurrently before and during their construction, by the same authority which adjudicated, first vaguely and afterwards with definite precision, upon the number and office of the Sacred Books themselves.

There is of course another sense in which all Christianity must depend on the Bible, for it is there chiefly that we find the historic warrant for the belief that such a life as Christ's was ever lived at all. But when we have used our Matthew, and John, and Paul, with Clement and Hermas, and the Pseudo-Areopagite and the rest, as we might use our Tacitus or our Josephus; and in the character of historic students have sifted out from these the fact that Christ's life and acts and work and personality are in the main as historic as Cæsar's; then, as a Catholic, I would say that we can collect from that account and the historic facts surrounding it the assurance not only that this momentous Person did found the Catholic Church—of which I am as certain as that Cæsar initiated the Empire—but also that in founding it He gave it a commission which, if He was truly

God, was verily Divine. Thus it is that when, in course of centuries we find it declared that Matthew, John and Paul are "of the canon of scripture," and are to be read as inspired writings, whereas Clement and Hermas, however venerable, are not; then we can go back to Matthew, and John and Paul and re-read them not as mere historical critics, but as humble students of the Word of God—and so are prepared to accept, on their authority endorsed by the authority of the faith, much in their narrative which, as historical critics, we were content to earmark as possibly legendary or of doubtful accuracy, and much in their doctrine which, as mere literature, might not have commended itself to a fastidious taste.

I have desired to define at some length this Catholic view of Christ's revelation and the Catholic attitude towards the Bible, as opposed to the Protestant theories on these matters, partly because it is vital to the understanding of Catholicism, and partly because it is seldom understood by those who stand outside the Church. I now pass to the consideration of some of the main lines of the Catholic teaching. It will be understood that I have indeed nothing to offer but a few suggestions, whose only value, if they have any, is that they have been borne in upon me by reason of much converse with those to whom Catholicism speaks the language of a strange country.

Upon the commonplaces of controversy I do not propose to waste time. The "errors of Rome" which exercise the mind of anti-Popery lecturers and other wise men, are for the most part beside the point. Too often they are either flat misstatements of Catholic belief, imputing to us what no Catholic would dream of teaching—as that "the end justifies the means"; or they are a travesty of something which is the merest fringe of that great body of doctrine, such as the ancient usage of Indulgences or the celibacy of the clergy. Of such things, at a fit time, I should not despair of giving you a wholly reasonable account; but if a man desires to appreciate the Catholic Faith as it deserves, it is not with these high points of controversy that he will begin. It is the broad base-lines of that majestic plan that such a one will look for. It is the pregnant words which, by that Living Voice, the Master speaks to all the world and to each man's soul.

I cannot hope to make you know these mighty words—which Paul heard in the third Heaven—which all of us will hear when the last trumpet sounds—which, as we well know, descend at the altar rails into many a simple heart. To the ear of faith, they are not hard to hear; but to state them in the common language of the world, and above all in the customary speech of modern England, is a work that for its full accomplishment must wait, I think, till God shall send again that gift of "prophecy," wherewith He touched the lips of John of the Golden Mouth, and lit the fiery eyes of Savonarola. Yet, however little power there be to do it, we must do the little that we may. For when we look back upon that woeful time when the Body of Christ was torn asunder, and the mightiest semblance of God's Kingdom which the world had seen was rent by civil war, I think we can-

not choose but say that these men, however we are to judge their motives or their aim, threw back the world's religious life by centuries.

We have had more than two hundred years of "Phoenix cremation" since the Bull of Wittenberg was burnt; but I doubt if another two hundred will place us at the point the world might have reached, if the party of reform had been led by men of the type of Savonarola and of Thomas More, rather than by Luther and Henry VIII. That is our view; but of those who take any other, we may at least demand that they shall be willing to labour with us to restore the broken unity, to heal the secular war, to point the nations, amid a chaos that seemingly grows worse with every tide of books, to that City whereof the pattern is laid up in heaven, whose walls are justice and whose ways are peace, since it is builded upon the rock of an assured authority, and lit for ever by the light of God.

I must pray you therefore to follow me a little, while I try to tell you what Catholicism means to me. It implies, first of all, a deep tremendous consciousness of the heaven-high difference between good and evil, truth and untruth, righteousness and sin. If it seems to be rigid in its teaching and in its insistence on obedience, it is because it feels that the tolerance which holds that one thing may as well be true as any other, is but an opening of the floodgates of all misery. Tolerance we are perfectly ready to give where it is due. Where a man believes error honestly, only because he is somehow disabled from seeing the truth, we do not venture to condemn him; but we cannot talk of it as if he were as likely to be right as we are, or as if it did not matter which of us was right at all. For when we say that we *believe*, we mean it; and when we profess to hold the Truth revealed by God in Christ, we hold it as a precious gift, the wanton loss of which would be by far more terrible than any worldly calamity.

As with truth, so with the consciousness of sin. We are reproached, unjustly enough, with some unreasonable hostility to modern progress, and to that all-pervading spirit of emancipation which is the pride of the children of the Great Revolution. Neither with progress, nor with science, nor with freedom, has the Church any quarrel. She has herself in many ways been the promoter and guardian of them all; but she has always been and is and will be jealous of the *souls* that are in danger, for she counts the risk of moral evil as a thing far graver than material prosperity. As we would all say, surely, in our personal ethics, that no amount of money gain should weigh with an honest man against his moral degradation; so the Church says, upon her wider plane, that no amount of monetary or material progress will compensate a generation, if thereby it suffers moral wreck. "What doth it profit a man," she cries from age to age, "if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Woe upon you," she cries to the heralds of comfortable Utopias of emancipation, "if by your recklessness the little ones of Christ are made to stumble and to fall." So much,—but no more. Churchmen have been mistaken, as we all admit, in their application of that principle. You are free to say bitter things about them

politics, if you will. But if you would do justice to the spirit which animated even the narrowest among them, you must remember that the thought which underlay their warfare was the paramount importance of saving, if possible, these little ones among their flock, from what seemed a probable risk of being led to sin against God.

Throughout all the Catholic doctrine and the living practice of the Church runs the same dominant note of the consciousness of sin. That God is above all things infinitely Holy—that every single grave and deliberate sin is a disaster to the universe which we cannot measure—that, in the things of human life, sin is indeed the *only* real evil that exists, and that to advance towards perfection of personal character is our only real progress—these are the alphabet of the Catholic rule of life. If it be asceticism to hold that our pain and pleasure are of absolutely no account in comparison with any moral gain, then we are all ascetics in our belief, however little we may fulfil that rule in practice. And the reason why we hold each particular sin a woeful evil, is because it appears to us as a direct contempt of God, who is our absolute Lord and infinite Benefactor, and because we feel that to Him by His essential nature, evil must needs be horrible altogether. If we are to talk of justice, therefore, any one rebellion could be enough to forfeit all His grace, forego His promises, and alienate the sinner by the issue of his own choice from that Heavenly Presence wherein no discord dwells.

Not only does the Church so think of sin, but she goes on to say that even if by repentance and in God's grace the direct offence is put away, the rebel absolved, the alien soul brought back into the happy family who are at home with God, yet even so the mischief of that once-committed sin is not put by. For it is the nature of evil to work itself out still, in evil and disablement and loss; and these, which are technically called the "temporal consequence" of sin, must needs be suffered even while there is rejoicing in Heaven over the sheep which was lost and now is found again. It is in this connection that we think of Purgatory. It is the life beyond this life where souls, who are indeed not rebels now but God's beloved penitents, must wait and toil and grow till they have wholly purged away the consequences of forgotten sin, and wrought upon the frail and faulty characters they built themselves, that final beauty of holiness which is alone receptive of the Vision of God.

But if the Church is stern and terrible in her anathemas on even the beginnings of moral wrong, she is not slow to preach the good tidings of the infinite mercy. I cannot profess to you that the God of whom she speaks is the God of those who go their easy ways and say, "He's a good fellow and 'twill all be well." She dare not bid us think it will be well, unless we will it. "He made us," says St. Austin, "without our consent, but He will not save us so." For with the consciousness of sin, the Church insists by logical necessity on the paramount fact of human freedom. When the human soul came from the creative fiat as a self capable of moral life,

and therein stamped with the very image of the Divine, it bore both the mark of responsibility and the inalienable power, in God's despite yet none the less triumphantly, to cause evil things to be, in what was God's fair universe before. Why did He do it? we may all ask; but with our little knowledge of the secrets of the Eternal we cannot give much other answer than that, as far as we can see, it was not possible to separate the transcendent gift of a potential moral goodness, whereby we are indeed ennobled as no other gift could honour us, from its correlative possibility of creating crime.

On Free Will, then, the Church insists; but she insists no less on Grace. If God be stainless purity, He is no less essential Love. If He does not *compel* us to obey the Holy Law, at least He plies us with inducement, with suggestion, with facility of every kind which infinite wisdom joined to infinite love can offer for our aid. The world which we inhabit is the world our fathers made, and it is beset with the results of old ancestral sin: for it is the tragic property of wrong that its ill consequences affect not only him who does it, but also those to whom his life is bound in this great family of struggling souls. We live then, not in a Paradise of God's arranging, but in a Babylon of crooked ways, whose streets are littered with the rotting evil and barred with the accumulated rubbish of that past which we inherit. I do not forget, still less deny, that this same Babylon is a mighty city, wherein are also goodly sights and gracious buildings not a few, with many that, though still imperfect, and it may be dangerous in their perfection, are full of promise for the later time. I am no decrier of the noble inheritance our fathers left us; yet I say that when I think of it as the abode wherein we must work out each of us his own salvation, it would to me seem little better than a fever swamp or stricken city of the plague, were it not for the grace of God.

For, as the Church conceives, the teeming millions who are born and die, at mere haphazard as it were, along the crooked ways, where to the human eye there is no light nor joy, are not forgotten. Up and down, as Jacob saw them, go the messengers of God. To all they come: to those who are working out, with fear and trembling always, yet with steady resolution, what they take to be for them the will of God; and to those who are wavering on the brink of danger; and to those no less—nay, rather, more eagerly, if possible,—who have already sinned and are persisting in their sin.

Up and down, too, go the messengers, in those hard places of the world where circumstance, to human eyes, is as a devil-giant coercing hapless lives not only into pain but into moral wreck. We do not say that evil circumstance, that plague inheritance of ancient sin, is a light thing. We think, indeed, that He who judges all of us will make allowance amply. It seems evident that to some the avoidance of a special sin—say drunkenness—is easier than to others. To none, short of moral madness, is sin in truth a necessity; and the madman's acts are not sin. What we conclude

is not so much that those who are thrown among evil surroundings are wholly to be excused, as that those of us who have had better advantage, have the deeper blame. But everywhere, and to each with the appropriate message, come the bearers of God's grace.

When the man who is clothed in purple and fine linen and fares sumptuously every day, is basking in a sensual ease, some warning, whether it take the form of Lazarus or no, awakes him to remember better things. When the stricken child, to whom life never brought a sweeter message than the harmony of the outward squalor and the inward pain, lies wistfully drifting towards the welcome end, there are hands unseen that clothe upon its soul the raiment of a lovely patience, and light up within its eyes the radiance of an unearthly lesson. When the successful Philistine is blotting day by day from the tablets of his brain the memory of any spiritual possibilities, there is a hand that constantly renews the unconsidered lines, so that he cannot choose but sometimes see them. For every battle there is an ally, for every frailty a support; with every temptation, however fierce it seems to our not quite impartial judgment, there goes forth for us the possibility of bearing it.

Conceiving thus of human life as a warfare wherein we daily fight with sin with the perpetual assistance of the grace of God, the Catholic Church presents to us, as the central fact of the world's history, the coming of the Christ.

It is not uncommon to reproach us with our acceptance of the supernatural; and our critics seem to be quite satisfied that the admission of any belief which involves things not explainable by so-called "natural law," is mere superstition—as absurd as witchcraft, and less respectable than Spiritualism or the Mind Cure. I will not stay to discuss this general point of view, but I will content myself with the remark that there is no necessary antagonism at all between Naturalism and the Supernatural, rightly understood. If Free Will be a fact, that alone transcends at once all that in the narrow sense is spoken of as "natural law;" for every free act, if it be truly free, introduces a spiritual new creation into the sequence of material and organic forces. Why should not the same be true in a wider field? If there be a personal God, why may His will not also intervene and mould the stolid course of physical change and consequence? And if there be such influence at all, why should we assume that it is opposed to Law? Rather must it be itself the action and evidence of a higher and more spiritual reason in things, which we perhaps cannot as yet follow, but which we too may some day see.

To the Catholic, then, the cardinal fact of the whole world's history is the birth, and life, and death of Christ. The old world leads up to it: the new is its development and outcome. Unique in all the centuries—lowliest and yet most royal—that dying Preacher, who was crucified by Jerusalem and Rome for saying that He was the very Son of God, is the corner-stone of the world fabric—the key of the human mystery—the Lord

of Life. Reading the simple narrative, waiving all question of inspiration, if you will, we can come to no other conclusion but that He claimed to be the Incarnate God. Not at all a wise Socrates—not in the least a later Isaiah—not a mystic nor a magician ; but the very God—the Word made Flesh—the absolute “ I AM ”

“Think, Abib ! Dost thou think ? The very God—
Lo, the All-Great were the All-Loving too—
Lo, through the thunder, speaks a human voice
Saying, ‘ A heart I made, a heart beats here—
Thou hast no power, nor may'st conceive of mine,
But love I gave thee, with Myself to love.
And thou *must* love Me, who have died for thee,’

The madman saith *He* said so—it is strange ! ”

Upon this absolute and central truth of Christ's Divinity, the Church insists as the focus and radiating point of all her teaching. I have spoken of her wide philosophy of sin and grace. For both, she takes us back at once to Christ. His life and death—the perfect sacrifice, the purifying and the reconciliation of sin-stained humanity—bore in it the needed infinite redemption, built in the counsels of the eternal mercy, the golden bridge by which every sinner may return. In the mystery of that Life and Death, at once true human and inalienably Divine, is the origin of all grace. He is the link between the Finite and the Infinite ; therefore He is the Way whereby we come to God, and whereby God communicates Himself to us. In that, by reason of His humanity, we are the brethren of the Son of God, so are we heirs of the Heavenly Kingdom. In His Sonship is the eternal Fatherhood of God revealed. In that He died, He conquered death ; in that He lived and liveth, He is the door of Life Eternal.

On all this, I say, the Catholic Church insists—and with far keener and more eager vigilance than any other of the confessions. For if Christ be not God, she feels, then is our hope vain. If He, who on a score of critical occasions claimed to be Divine, was but a madman or a fraud, let us not play at Christianity—let us rather eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Because from the first she guarded this essential truth before all else, therefore she spent centuries in defining and maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity and the related doctrine of the Person of Christ, the Human and Divine. The elaborate formulæ of the Nicene theology and the rest are not scholastic subtleties or the quibbles of an oriental fancy : they are the necessary basis and security of the vital fact of Christianity. It is either these, or nothing.

And as she has insisted always on the doctrine of the 'Trinity, so, for exactly the same reason, she has been careful to uphold the honourable prerogative of her, whom from the earliest centuries she has styled the Mother of God. Wonderful, indeed, it is to any Catholic to hear the stale invectives which are still bestowed on “ Mariolatry,” as if somehow the worship of the Divine were squandered on a creature ; for there lives no

Catholic so ignorant as not to be able to tell you the true answer—that we honour her precisely because to do otherwise would be to ignore the real Godhead of her Son.

Believing, then, that Christ is the “very God of very God,” who took upon Himself the human nature and dwelt with us on earth awhile, the Church presents His earthly work under four different aspects—though these also are in truth the same. He is the Saviour of the world; He is the Revelation of the Truth of God; He is the Perfect Life; and He is the Founder of the spiritual kingdom. You will see that each and all of these grow naturally and at once out of the main conception of His nature and His office. In the world-reconciliation, it was needful that men should learn to know God better, and that they should be taught to do His will, seeing that the human wisdom and human good intentions had not sufficed. Equally, as I have sought to show you, was it necessary that an abiding institute should be created—not indeed a kingdom of this world, but yet a palpable, continuing, organic fact—a sure custodian and an abiding witness.

On some of these points I have dwelt already—of all, there is abundant notice in the Gospel texts. To insist on them at length here would carry me beyond my scope. I pass therefore at once to say that beyond this fundamental insistence on the Divine character of Christ, there is another derivative sense in which the Catholic Church insists constantly upon the supernatural.

I said that, in her view, the life of man must needs be constantly assisted by the spiritual help of God; and that she presents the life and death of Christ as being, in the design of Providence, the fountain of this un-failing Grace.

Now it is her special pride and office to be a means of salvation available to all—to be a Church truly Catholic, to whom nothing of humanity is alien, from whom the beggar can draw spiritual wealth as surely as the prince or the professor, though they too find, if they will seek it, all the special help they need. To the end that there should be in the world such tangible and easy ways of entering into the Heavenly Communion, of appropriating, each poor nature for itself, the riches of the treasure of the Lord, the Church believes that Christ ordained that series of symbolic rites, adapted to the crises of our life, which we call Sacraments; and that it was His will to appoint concerning these that they should be to His disciples (apart from prayer) the ordinary channels of the communication of that grace and pardon and spiritual sustenance which in and through the office of our Saviour we claim from the Almighty. True is it, that this infinite ocean of Love is waiting for us all the while. Yet, in the spiritual order, Love, too, has its own laws, and this is one of them. That by Christ's appointment we draw its channels into our souls as freely and as fully as we will, or as our capacity for receiving it will allow, by obeying the

sacramental ordinances of the Christian dispensation in faith and love and humble trust in Him.

I need not tell you—for it is patent—that of this sacramental system the central fact is that which more than any theoretic point marks off the life of the Church Catholic from everything beyond it—the acceptance of the Real Presence of the Lord upon our altars under the sacramental form.

To those who approach this as mere critics, bringing neither personal experience nor sympathy to aid them, no man can hope to say what it implies. To them I will only say, "You read the 'Imitation' and you hold it a great book—one of the treasures of the world—a mirror and revelation of the holiest in man. Read, then, the sacramental chapters of that soul-swaying meditation, and go back and scoff at us, if you can." Or let them go, if they prefer life to literature, into any Catholic church—not at a fashionable midday Mass, but in the early morning, on some great day like Easter or the Birth of Christ—and watch the still, rapt gladness that has fallen on the meanest faces, watch the fellowship and democracy of the altar rails, catch the energy of better effort and of new beginning, and the enthusiasm of sincere repentance, and the nobility of high worship that makes the air electric, and tell us, if they can, that it is all no more than mummery and priestcraft, folly countersigned by fraud.

All this may be deception, you will say; and undoubtedly, although subjective testimony may be much to us who have believed, to others it is at the best a noticeable phenomenon. Something more is wanted. We must show a reason for our faith in this most startling or most mystic doctrine of a spiritual Presence that transcends not only sense but maddest imagination, of which yet there is no outward sign at all.

Our first reason, naturally, is in the Bible text itself. We say, and I confess I cannot conceive that an intelligent atheist would doubt it, that Christ said neither more nor less than what the Church teaches concerning the Eucharist, not only when He founded that rite on the most solemn occasion of His intercourse with His Apostles, but at many other times; and, above all, in that test discussion which is recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John. But strong as is the Scriptural argument, the Church has another that is perhaps still stronger.

The doctrine of the Real Presence, linked with that of the ordinance of the Last Supper as a mystic yet most effectual commemoration and representation of the Passion of the Lord, is the essence and import of "the Mass." Now that great act of common worship and of mystic sacrifice, of solemn commemoration and public prayer for all the living and the dead, is, and has always been, the central office of the Church—in every age and nation substantially, nay even minutely, the same. Being so notable a corporate act, it has been always safe-guarded by jealous provision for a settled liturgical form. There is no time in the history of Christendom when that liturgy is not before us as a palpable and most significant record; for in every age and under every variation it testifies beyond cavi¹

to the belief in a Real Sacramental Presence of the Lord as the whole point and meaning of the great office. I suppose there are many able and learned persons who imagine, in a very careless ignorance, that the Mass is a "fond thing vainly invented" somewhere in the Middle Ages. Yet nothing is more palpably untrue.

The case stands thus. There exist certain great types of the Liturgy of the Mass—all perfectly at one in their intent and doctrine and general plan, and even in their main forms of prayer and in unexpected coincidences of phrase and action, yet varying in practical arrangements and filled in with details evidently arising by local usage. Each of these is clearly *parallel to* and not *derived from* the others. Each is attributed by the local tradition to an apostle, who was the early founder of the local church. Each is carried up, by a separate chain of documentary and historical evidence, to a time not very many generations removed from the living witness of those who saw and heard the Lord. What is more clear as a mere matter of scientific historical criticism, than that these great trunk lines of liturgical tradition must have diverged from a common Apostolic type or norm—and that this type must have been, as they are, a central and sacramental and commemorative office, involving a Real Presence, and being to them in all essentials what the office of the Mass has been to us to-day?

Probably many of you will be incredulous, but the proofs are very simple. At Rome, we have the Liturgy which is now the common, though by no means the only form used in the Catholic Church, and we trace it back so far, that details of its use are attributed to Popes who ruled between 100 A.D. and 120 A.D. The names of the Saints commemorated in the text are known to have been added by gradual accretion, and yet all of them, with a solitary exception, were martyred before A.D. 310 (the excepted date being 362), while the earlier names go back to Linus, Cletus, and Clement, the immediate successors of Peter's Chair. Ambrose of Milan, himself the editor of a special rite still preserved there, cites some of the Roman prayers soon after 400 A.D., as being taken from what he then called "the ancient rites." Like all the others, it was preserved in oral tradition, by reason of the Discipline of the Secret, until the fifth century; but we have on record, in the Epistles of St. Innocent I. in the fourth century, that Pope's opinion that the Liturgy was, in fact, the true tradition given by St. Peter to the Church at Rome.

Turn now to the other great rite preserved at Alexandria, which in like manner was committed to writing by St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, after 400 A.D., and ascribed by him and by the whole Church to the direct oral tradition of St. Mark himself. The internal evidence of the prayers, as they were then set down and have been since preserved, points to the period of persecution, say 300 A.D., as the date of some of the added prayers, the body of the rite being therefore earlier. The condemnation of the Eutychian opinions in 451 led to the schism which detached all the

sacramental ordinances of the Christian dispensation in faith and love and humble trust in Him.

I need not tell you—for it is patent—that of this sacramental system the central fact is that which more than any theoretic point marks off the life of the Church Catholic from everything beyond it—the acceptance of the Real Presence of the Lord upon our altars under the sacramental form.

To those who approach this as mere critics, bringing neither personal experience nor sympathy to aid them, no man can hope to say what it implies. To them I will only say, "You read the 'Imitation' and you hold it a great book—one of the treasures of the world—a mirror and revelation of the holiest in man. Read, then, the sacramental chapters of that soul-swaying meditation, and go back and scoff at us, if you can." Or let them go, if they prefer life to literature, into any Catholic church—not at a fashionable midday Mass, but in the early morning, on some great day like Easter or the Birth of Christ—and watch the still, rapt gladness that has fallen on the meanest faces, watch the fellowship and democracy of the altar rails, catch the energy of better effort and of new beginning, and the enthusiasm of sincere repentance, and the nobility of high worship that makes the air electric, and tell us, if they can, that it is all no more than mummary and priestcraft, folly countersigned by fraud.

All this may be deception, you will say; and undoubtedly, although subjective testimony may be much to us who have believed, to others it is at the best a noticeable phenomenon. Something more is wanted. We must show a reason for our faith in this most startling or most mystic doctrine of a spiritual Presence that transcends not only sense but maddest imagination, of which yet there is no outward sign at all.

Our first reason, naturally, is in the Bible text itself. We say, and I confess I cannot conceive that an intelligent atheist would doubt it, that Christ said neither more nor less than what the Church teaches concerning the Eucharist, not only when He founded that rite on the most solemn occasion of His intercourse with His Apostles, but at many other times; and, above all, in that test discussion which is recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John. But strong as is the Scriptural argument, the Church has another that is perhaps still stronger.

The doctrine of the Real Presence, linked with that of the ordinance of the Last Supper as a mystic yet most effectual commemoration and representation of the Passion of the Lord, is the essence and import of "the Mass." Now that great act of common worship and of mystic sacrifice, of solemn commemoration and public prayer for all the living and the dead, is, and has always been, the central office of the Church—in every age and nation substantially, nay even minutely, the same. Being so notable a corporate act, it has been always safe-guarded by jealous provision for a settled liturgical form. There is no time in the history of Christendom when that liturgy is not before us as a palpable and most significant record; for in every age and under every variation it testifies beyond cavil

to the belief in a Real Sacramental Presence of the Lord as the whole point and meaning of the great office. I suppose there are many able and learned persons who imagine, in a very careless ignorance, that the Mass is a "fond thing vainly invented" somewhere in the Middle Ages. Yet nothing is more palpably untrue.

The case stands thus. There exist certain great types of the Liturgy of the Mass—all perfectly at one in their intent and doctrine and general plan, and even in their main forms of prayer and in unexpected coincidences of phrase and action, yet varying in practical arrangements and filled in with details evidently arising by local usage. Each of these is clearly *parallel to* and not *derived from* the others. Each is attributed by the local tradition to an apostle, who was the early founder of the local church. Each is carried up, by a separate chain of documentary and historical evidence, to a time not very many generations removed from the living witness of those who saw and heard the Lord. What is more clear as a mere matter of scientific historical criticism, than that these great trunk lines of liturgical tradition must have diverged from a common Apostolic type or norm—and that this type must have been, as they are, a central and sacramental and commemorative office, involving a Real Presence, and being to them in all essentials what the office of the Mass has been to us to-day?

Probably many of you will be incredulous, but the proofs are very simple. At Rome, we have the Liturgy which is now the common, though by no means the only form used in the Catholic Church, and we trace it back so far, that details of its use are attributed to Popes who ruled between 100 A.D. and 120 A.D. The names of the Saints commemorated in the text are known to have been added by gradual accretion, and yet all of them, with a solitary exception, were martyred before A.D. 310 (the excepted date being 362), while the earlier names go back to Linus, Cletus, and Clement, the immediate successors of Peter's Chair. Ambrose of Milan, himself the editor of a special rite still preserved there, cites some of the Roman prayers soon after 400 A.D., as being taken from what he then called "the ancient rites." Like all the others, it was preserved in oral tradition, by reason of the Discipline of the Secret, until the fifth century; but we have on record, in the Epistles of St. Innocent I. in the fourth century, that Pope's opinion that the Liturgy was, in fact, the true tradition given by St. Peter to the Church at Rome.

Turn now to the other great rite preserved at Alexandria, which in like manner was committed to writing by St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, after 400 A.D., and ascribed by him and by the whole Church to the direct oral tradition of St. Mark himself. The internal evidence of the prayers, as they were then set down and have been since preserved, points to the period of persecution, say 300 A.D., as the date of some of the added prayers, the body of the rite being therefore earlier. The condemnation of the Eutychian opinions in 451 led to the schism which detached all the

Copts from Rome; yet the Copts have to this day a form of the same Sacramental Liturgy of St. Mark and St. Cyril, which was old among them.

If you go to Syria, the great Liturgy of Jerusalem, ascribed to the tradition of St. James himself and to the direct development of the Church described in the Acts of the Apostles, is the Liturgy long used by and still preserved among the Eastern Eutychians, who therefore held it as the true tradition before 450. The Nestorians, who have been separated since 431, keep to this day a related rite, named from St. Thaddæus the Apostle. Indeed, we are told that Nestorius was the first of the schismatics of whom it is even *alleged* that he had altered the ancient Liturgy. It is curious to remember that the Portuguese, when they discovered Malabar in the sixteenth century, found a native church there using this very rite; and it is now clear that they had it from the Nestorian Church of Babylon, where it was in use before 400. But we carry this rite still further back with an absolute historic certainty. For it happens by good fortune that there are preserved to us the Sunday-school lessons of St. Cyril, who was Bishop of Jerusalem in 347. In these he actually instructs his catechumens in the ritual and meaning of the Mass, and for that purpose he explains point by point this venerable liturgy of St. James, much as we have it still as the basis of a hundred local rites throughout the Catholic East.

Now each of these three great normal types of the Eucharistic tradition—that of Peter at Rome, that of James at Jerusalem, that of Mark at Alexandria—is perfectly independent. No scholar can dream that any is derived from, or even moulded by, any other. The hundreds of minor variations fall to the scholar's criticism easily under one or other of these or other equally ancient types. But the types themselves are sisters, not inter-dependent but collateral; and therefore they are sisters of a common stock. These three or four most venerable types—to leave aside the others—*involve an archetype*. Yet each of them by about the year 300, was not only established but old, and based by those who loved it upon an Apostolic tradition. Who made the common archetype, I pray you, which Rome and Alexandria and Jerusalem and Babylon assume? In what common Eucharistic centre do these traditions meet? Who taught the half-dozen intervening generations to accept this appalling mystery with common certainty, as a thing not doubted even when dogmatic heresy was rife and all the world rang with polemical debate—as a thing which every schismatic took with him, whatever else he left? Who taught it, I ask, or could have taught it, but the Master who on the world-historic night, commanded them to do in memory of Him the solemn act which He did then.

If you still doubt what I say of the Apostolic origin of the Eucharistic Act, I would have you read what is not hard of access—the *Apologia* of Justin, who is called the "Philosopher," addressed as early as 138 A.D. to Antoninus Pius, in defence of the Christian faith. Therein, speaking generally of the existing rites, for he had lived in Syria and at Alexandria

and Rome, he describes the outline of the Mass. As the core and heart of it, he insists in plain terms on the doctrine of the Real Presence. With great simplicity and directness he bases both the doctrine and the office upon the institutionary words of Christ. And as if to exclude any caviller who might suppose it a new idea of his own or his contemporaries, he goes on to remark as a striking fact that "the evil spirits" (as he puts it) "have introduced this very solemnity into the mysteries of Mithra," the then fashionable ritualism of Rome; proving so that to his knowledge, — and he was a master of all the schools before his baptism, — the Mass was older than these fantastic Eastern rites, and was, in fact, as it claimed to be, the commemorative office framed by those who first received the Eucharist at the very hands of Christ.

If then the Mass we have to-day was known as the ancient and undoubted worship of the Churches by this Syrian convert, born when John, if dead, was only just dead, and to whom John's personal disciples and the immediate followers of James and Paul must have been known, what will you say? If the "Supper of the Lord," which Paul was setting in order among the Corinthians about 50 A.D., was not the same thing as Justin was admitted to about 120 A.D., who altered it? Not the beloved disciple, or his pupil if you will, who wrote the Fourth Gospel; for the Fourth Gospel insists most markedly on this very Eucharistic doctrine. Not the Church at Rome; for there, as I have said, the tradition preserved by well remembered records from the joint martyrdom of Peter and Paul down to the Sacramentary of Gelasius is unbroken by any hint of variance. The answer is that there is no change, no innovation; only an untiring effort to hold fast the ordinance of the Saviour, who left it as His most precious legacy when He went out to die.

Terrible it is, if you will—surpassing human speech—this point of heavenly fire that lives within our worship. You will tell me it is vain to trace it back to the Apostles, for the thing itself is past believing. I admit that if Christ be not God, our hope is vain—our holy office, as you say, a mummerly—our Communion with the Lord of Heaven and Earth a bitter fraud. But I warn you that if you come with me so far as to agree that Christ was, and that He was Divine, you must come further. If you repudiate the whole record, I understand you. But every competent critic now admits that quite worthy witnesses are before us. If you take the witness as of any weight at all, you cannot put aside the clear consensus and wilful repetition of the three Synoptics who record the words of institution; nor the still fuller and more deliberate enforcement of the same by Paul; nor, above all, that vivid dramatic sermon in the sixth of John.

I have dwelt long upon the subject of the Mass and of the Eucharistic doctrine. It is, I think, an obvious dividing line between those conceptions of faith and worship which in our own day are tending towards Catholicism, and those which lead away from it. I have only time to pass now to one other aspect of the Catholic Church, in which it appeals with

peculiar force to the present struggling generation, and to the coming time.

As the root idea of the Protestant Reformers was flat individualism, so the dominant note of the Catholic conception of the world is solidarity. In the beginning, the Church was all but a communism. In the days of persecution, all who had, without other compulsion than the love that Christ revealed, gave up their wealth to feed the needy; and this fraternal distribution was directly organized by the Church. At all times, though she has allowed private property, she has suggested that to forego it is the better way. At all times, to those who keep their own, she has preached a far-reaching duty of charity to all the world, which, if it were carried out, would leave little disparity to mourn.

As in property, so in all else. The universal brotherhood has been to her no empty name, but a world-reforming fact and law. Strongly, through bribe and menace, she has striven to uphold the equality of prince and peasant before the moral code; and it is her pride to remember that even when the hatred of the English Crown was the penalty of refusal, a weak and hunted and tormented Pope refused to mete out to the Tudor any other marriage law than would be meted out to the meanest hind within his realm.

And no less is it our pride that we can say that while the Church stood upright, here and elsewhere—even to the latest hour of what they call her worst corruption—she provided for the people a career, far more sure and better worth their following than the most advanced democracy has given them since.

Take the great Churchmen, who, by their sheer ability and learning, did the chief part of the government of the world for many a century. They are a noble line, promoted often to an almost royal dignity, and in the vast majority of cases for no reason except their talents, or their virtues, or both; and of these men an enormous multitude are the children of the poor. There was not a country side that had not within reach its abbey or its cathedral; and where a peasant lad showed promise, and desired at once to serve God and to make his life useful upon a wider plane, it was very certain he would be put to school and made a "clerk;" and once a clerk, the Church to him was but an organized democracy, wherein nothing, even to the Papal chair, was inaccessible to merit. You have sown the land with schools; you have improved the Poor Law and multiplied philanthropies; and you do well: but for all these things it was easier for the deserving helpless ones of the earth to find help in their need, and easier for those whom God endowed with power to find their rightful place, before Henry sacked the monasteries and made himself the English Pope.

If you pass to social or to political liberty, it is still the same. In the Brotherhood of Christ the Church saw neither bond nor free. The patrician maiden and the slave-girl, in the Acts of the Early Martyrs, meet as equals

and as friends. As swiftly as human inertia allowed, the Church abolished slavery. In the home, she found woman degraded by the licentiousness of the age. She freed them at a stroke when she declared that marriage was a Sacrament of God; and when she placed above her altars, as the symbol next in holiness to the Incarnate God, her stainless ideal of womanhood and maternity, she did more to hold in check men's proneness to brutality than all the laws that ever punished crime. In our own and every other struggling commonwealth, when the feudal power was at its worst, and threatened to engulf for ever the liberties of the tenants of the soil, it was the Church more than any other single force that bearded these lords of war, and made it possible for the common people to achieve their liberty. So it was the Church that gave articulate voice to justice and to civic reason, in adapting first and in administering afterwards the codes of written law; and here, as everywhere, she was but seeking, after the rough-hewn fashion of human institutions, to carry out Christ's paramount commandment—the Law of Love.

But not only within each single state was she a power for justice and emancipation—she was more and greater than them all. By the character of her Catholic title and her Catholic commission, she held up before the peoples the ideal of a world-community. Amid the lawless violence of the mail-clad centuries, she provided at least a possible arbiter. And however men may sneer at the ambition of the Popes, the European peace would be much nearer than it is to-day if the notable example of Prince Bismarck could be adopted as a commonplace of diplomacy.

When the Empire fell, the Church upheld its claim. To this hour, she refuses in the name of her commission, and she will refuse, to bind herself by any frontiers, or to be otherwise than independent in her own field of every national government whether it wears its crown in Rome or no. She knows that the world-progress is hampered while our narrow frontiers hedge us in with prejudice and tariffs, and our national self-seekings and distorted patriotisms keep all the nations lowering at each other like caged beasts, and stifle industry and freedom and every noble thing beneath the immeasurable load of military preparation; she looks for a better time when the human brotherhood may be, even in statecraft, a practical reality.

Yet not even here can I pause. For if she prophesies of a World-State, and laughs at the little fences statesmen draw upon the map, no less does she bid us think of even such a commonwealth as but one province of the Heavenly Kingdom. "The Church" to her cannot be bounded by the little scene whereon we play our parts a little while; for the Church is the Body of Christ. In our Father's house there are many mansions; and this is but the outer porch. Beyond the grave her children are not far away. She has taught and always teaches that they are linked to us, and we to them, in that Community of Saints which reaches upwards to the throne of God. It may be that they, our brethren, are of the company of the Church Suffering—purging away, by what endurance and patience and

travail we know not, the mortal stains they carried from the warfare of the Church Militant, where we were comrades and brethren in arms. It may be that already, if with our measures we can rightly appraise what with the immortals takes the place of time, they have passed into that other company of the Church Triumphant, whose place is in the sight of God. Yet wheresoever they may be, our comrades, we can reach our hands to them and they to us, in prayer and spiritual fellowship, and unseen in God's ordering a common life goes on. Members we are then, of one another—here and in the unknown: members of one transcendent spiritual yet organic whole—and that whole is the Body of Christ.

Endless, of course, are the things that yet remain to say concerning the great tradition of the Catholic teaching. Endless also, I believe, are the ways in which it would be well for us and for our children, if the Catholic Truth were so stated in our modern speech, that those who now say that every Catholic must needs be either knave or fool, could understand the things that they despise. For the present purpose I am content if I have been able in any measure to set forth these three outstanding aspects of the Catholic belief—the claim of the Living Voice, the treasure of the Sacraments, the Brotherhood of the Body of Christ. Like all else in Truth, they are but different aspects of the same thing,—the application, namely, of the work of Christ to the needs of all humanity. They are the same in this also, that in each there comes the note of Catholicity. In Christ all men are one,—and that, not merely in any formal or theoretic unity, but in a brotherhood which, if we could once translate it into the formulæ of government, would leave Democracies and Socialisms behind.

Those who take themselves to be the best exponents of Western civilization, have been accustomed of late to treat the Church with scant courtesy; and I agree that if, as some of them suppose, religion, and perhaps duty also, is altogether to vanish from the earth, then the study of Catholicism would be but a waste of energy. But if, as I believe, the moral and religious consciousness of man be no less a fact than knowledge or physical growth or life or death, then I claim that this transcendent expression of religion through the Christian centuries demands a hearing from them all. They call it dead, yet it is more alive, in the moulding of humanity, than all their schools. They say it belongs to a forgotten past, but there are not wanting signs that it shall inherit the future. In the field of ethics and religion, England, like the rest, is dividing rapidly into two camps—those who do and those who do not hold that religion is unnecessary and any reality of God superfluous. When that division is complete, it will be seen that the walls of the camp of the believers are but the fold of the Catholic Church.

In the field of social and political relations the old order changes day by day more swiftly. Much is gone and more will go. Surely one thing is clear: that neither just industry nor social health nor noble government is possible, unless we build on something better than self-seeking, and

appeal to something holier than "the desire of a remembered pleasure"? Individualism, and the Manchester School, and freedom of contract, and all the theories that sought justice in the war of interests and progress in the clash of infinite selfishness, are being carried out before our eyes to burial. Protestantism is fighting for its life with organic disintegration and intellectual doubt, to which it can oppose neither a reasoned philosophy of life nor any authoritative gospel. It cannot rescue the body politic, for it cannot save itself. The masses leave it on the one side, and the leaders of opinion on the other. Is there no hope at all, of light and leadership in the coming time?

I submit to you that the promises of the Messiah have not failed. His followers were the social saviours of the earlier Europe; it is not more difficult to help the centuries that lie before us. That which He promised to uphold, lives on; and, gathering up the ancient truth and the modern hope, it points the nations, now as always, to that true Republic, where freedom is the law of duty; where all are equal as the sons of God; and where fraternity is the willing service of the brotherhood of Christ, when the Kingdom of the Lord shall come.

THE MASS.

BY B. F. C. COSTELLOE, M.A.

I FELT that I was attempting a difficult task when I ventured to address you last year on the broad subject of "The Church Catholic." Your kindness and patience then have made me think it possible to accept your renewed invitation, and to speak to you of a subject harder still for me to deal with wisely and for you to rightly apprehend; for I suppose there is not one of the institutions of the world which has been, and is, so great a stumbling-block to modern Englishmen as is that great historic and spiritual fact which is the subject of this address.

I have taken it for two converse reasons. To all Catholics it is, and has been since Christianity began, the very heart and centre of the spiritual life. To the majority of Englishmen, and to most of you, it must have hitherto seemed to be a relic of barbarism and a psychological enigma. The very name of the "Mass" has been for centuries a byword among you, connoting to the unheeding generation of our fathers only an exploded superstition and an aimless mummerly. In our own time, since Protestantism of the original type has begun to give way before the advance of a more consistent unbelief, the great names and uses of the Church have not been visited with so much obloquy,—perhaps, with some, because they have been relegated to a deeper contempt. Yet I dare to hold and say that what lack there is among you of sympathy, of respect, nay, of belief, is in the main the outcome not of an evil will, but of a lack of opportunity; and it is for that reason that I make bold to try if at least some poor beginning may be made by setting forth the Catholic beliefs in language less strange to your own habits of thought than is the common language of our books of doctrine or devotion. That the task is too great for me, I know only too well. I have neither the knowledge nor the spiritual insight, neither the preparatory training nor the official authority, which that man must have who would state the truths of God to this hurrying generation. And yet, poor preachers though we be, there lies, I think, on all of us a duty, when occasion comes, to do our little spell of work in building up the roads of truth. In the day of beginnings we may be able to do little; but if we do our little work in God's own time, "that prophet" shall rise. London is not more proud of the swift advance of culture than was Florence in its new birth of knowledge and triumphant art; yet Savonarola led Florence captive, in the power of God. London is not half so hopeless of Christianity, not half so sunk in the mad endeavour to fill up the void of the spirit with the sweet things of the flesh, as was the Paris

of fifty years ago ; and yet all Paris was swept into reverent attention by the voice of Lacordaire. Pray with me, my friends, if you still pray, that God may send His prophet unto us also—if it be but as one crying in the wilderness, that after all the long confusion, the way of the Lord may be made straight again, and His good tidings preached abroad ; so that they who have ears to hear—they who have not stopped the ears God gave them with the wax of self-indulgence or with the wool of slipshod, careless, idle ways of thought—may hear and understand.

I have said that to the majority of the English people the Mass is a byword ; and yet there is a large and important section of them who have nevertheless been drifting steadily towards all forms of Catholic usage and belief. Those who are not of them may mix but little among them ; but if they would reckon with the currents of the time, they cannot overlook the startling growth of a pro-Catholic party in England. I do not mean the mere triflers in ecclesiastical fancy work. I mean those who speak of sacramental, of eucharistic, doctrine in terms an outsider would not easily be able to discriminate from our own. The fact has its significance, even for the world of unbelief. If you count those who, since Newman, have joined the Church outright with those who have come so close to it that for this purpose they are our allies, you will find that there is a Catholic school of thought among you which may well claim a respectful hearing. Men who are eminent in politics ought to be no bad judges of a thing so human as religious tendencies—and it is a curious fact that the actual chiefs of both the political parties are earnest and avowed believers in everything probably which I shall have to say to-day.

It is not much to count heads, but we have startling things to say, which to many of you may seem but a midsummer madness. Therefore, we pray you to remember that, apart from other times and other lands, there are those among your political leaders, among your judges and your greatest lawyers, among your best scientific men, and in every rank and circumstance of English life, who, being no more fools than any of you, yet find it possible and imperative to believe these strange and startling things, as truths for which they would be well content to die, if need were, and by which, as their main spiritual stay, they live their daily life among you. This does not begin to prove that our beliefs are true ; but it does prove that they are not incredible.

How shall I even begin to speak of it ? To us of the family of the faith it is a fact so familiar, so closely woven in with all we know of God and of the spiritual experience, that we hardly put it into words. You may haunt our ceremonies and know our printed prayers by heart, yet if you do not bring to them some Catholic sense, you will find but the tinkling cymbal and the sounding brass. In the first centuries it was pre-eminently "the secret"—that fact of the new life so holy, so beloved, that no profane eye should see it, and none but they who were prepared to love it should even know the mystery. We have fallen far, in these easy times,

below the fervour of their devotion ; yet in our measure the same is true of us. To-day, as then,—in this city, as in the catacombs,—it is the secret of holy souls, the guarded heart of fire in many a commonplace, unnoticed life. Outwardly it may seem to you often a trivial thing, with tinkling bells and inartistic ornament ; but equally in the silence and the song, in the poverty and in the pride, it is the tense communion of our myriads of souls, each for itself and in its own way, with the hidden presence of the Lord. The Mass is the one essential act of the public worship of the Church. It is designed to combine the new idea of a sacrament with the old tradition of a sacrifice. It is in truth a hundred things in one—as complete in its adaptation to every private need as it is rigid in its ritual adherence to the canons of the earliest liturgy. But, above and before all else, it is the commemoration of the death of Christ, and of that Last Supper when He left this ordinance to His disciples, as a momentous legacy and a last command.

There are two linked beliefs relating to that Last Supper which must be borne in mind by every one who would approach in any honest way the consideration of the Mass. They are the sacramental doctrine of the Eucharist, and the belief that Christ then founded by His recorded words and deeds an ordinance since followed in the Liturgies of the Church. The vindication of these involves, of course, all Catholicism : the testimony and value of the New Testament, the question of the person and office of Christ, the reality of any religion, the personality of God. The Catholic view of the world hangs together ; you must take it or reject it as a whole. It is, as I have already sought to show you, the only consistent Christianity—the only escape from the quicksands of private interpretation or the deep sea of sceptical suspense. The proof or disproof of this claim is the ultimate question. For the present, however, I take it that your chief desire is to know *what we mean* ; and therefore I say that, for the apprehension of our meaning, you must first realize that we do in truth believe in the world-historic scene in that upper room. It is in that narrative—the account, as we maintain, of a Divine Person—that we find the key to and the warrant for the office of the Mass ; and I think that unbiassed readers will probably agree with us that, if the words recorded were said at all, their sense is not really doubtful. They certainly were not understood in any but the one way, either by the Apostles or their immediate pupils, or by the ages of the Church, or even by the countless heresies, until Luther and his friends went a-hunting for new interpretations.

Recall for a moment the familiar story. The strange sending of Peter and John to claim the room “because the Master’s time was near at hand :” the keeping of their last Passover, with all that it implied to them as the central office of the Jewish system, in which the lamb was slain in token of the saving of Israel but of the land of bondage in the early days ; the memory in their minds of His repeated prophecies that He

would leave them soon, and of that recent scene when the Healer of Lazarus rode into Jerusalem amid the hosannas of the people, waving triumphal palms; the sudden shock when Jesus girt Himself with a towel and began to wash the feet of all the twelve, that, as He said, they might be "wholly clean" for some great event to come; the high words of commission that followed, "Verily I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me;" and then the culminating words of institution,—concurrently recorded with religious care in the three synoptic gospels, designedly omitted in the Gospel of John,—commemorated by the testimony of the Apostolic writings, and by the unbroken tradition of the Church's Liturgies,—when (having said, "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer") "He took bread, and giving thanks He brake it (*εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε*), and gave unto them, saying, Take and eat. This is My body which is given for you. This do in commemoration of Me."

You will know that when He says, "*Do this*," He uses a word appropriate to a sacrificial act, "Do this office, perform this rite, in memory of Me." You will notice also, that when He identifies the Eucharistic Bread with His body, He is careful, according to all the witnesses, to use the clear present tense, "My body which is even now being broken," or (as another puts it), "being given over to death" for you.

These were strange sayings, my brethren, either senseless or supernatural. But they understood. For they remembered that preliminary lesson which John has recorded in his sixth chapter, for the confirming of this very teaching in a later time, when much was in danger of being forgotten or misbelieved. They remembered—how could they forget it?—when to those cavillers who asked for such a sign as was the manna to their fathers He replied, "*I am the Bread of Life*," "The bread I will give is My *flesh*;" and they cried out, "How can this man—this carpenter's son—give us His flesh to eat?"

But His words beat down on them again, royal, imperative, unyielding. "Moreover, I say to you, Except ye *eat* the *flesh* of the Son of man, ye have no life in you. . . . He that *eateth* My *flesh* and *drinketh* My *blood*, *dwelleth* in *Me* and *I* in *him*." And now not the Jews only, but almost all His followers, rebelled. It is a hard saying—who can hear it? "How can we eat His flesh?" Does He retract, or soften, or explain? Nay; but as He had begun by telling them that the work of God was to believe Him that He had sent, so now in this crisis of their faith He asks only for belief again. And many—all but the twelve, it seems—went back and walked with Him no more. Did He say, "Ye have taken a parable too literally?" Did He offer a hidden meaning? He only turned sadly, half wearily, to His twelve, and said, "Will ye too go away?" And Peter answered—not, "It is easy;" not "We understand;" but with a cry of faith, confident through all strange teaching, even as are we Catholics to-

day, that the message was Divine—"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

I have said that the writer of the Fourth Gospel omits the words of institution, as being in his day the common knowledge of the Church. But the vast importance which he attaches to the fact is made all the more clear by the wonderful sermon, burning with the Divine Love, and instinct with the idea of the Divine Communion as the root of all the holiness of that new life, which, like the earlier lesson, he alone reports. He wrote somewhere about 100 A.D., long after the Synoptics and the writings of St. Paul. And it is important to notice that the same connection between the idea of the Eucharist with its sacramental communion and the idea of the unity of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, wherein Christ's life and love must needs be indwelling, had been also worked out in other forms by the Pauline Epistles.

It is not possible to detail within any reasonable limits the great number of indications to be found in the New Testament as to the continuance by the earliest followers of Christ of a commemorative rite, in which this "giving of thanks" at the "breaking of the bread" was repeated in an evidently sacramental sense, and as an act of public worship. There is a hint of it even in the story of Emmaus. But immediately after Pentecost we are told that the converts "continued steadfast in the Apostle's doctrine, and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and prayer," where evidently this "breaking of bread" is a distinctive note and observance of the Christians. A little later their action is described by saying that they "continued daily with one accord in the Temple" (at their public resort in Solomon's Porch), and "breaking bread from house to house," as each afforded that "upper room" in which they loved to commemorate the Supper of the Lord. In the latter part of the Acts there is more explicit notice of this same observance, as of a public gathering for worship, in the account plainly given by a fellow-traveller and eye-witness of St. Paul's visit to Troas. They found there an important community, and the words of the writer give us a graphic picture. He describes the upper chamber, with its many lights. He says that on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together for the breaking of bread (apparently now a technical phrase), Paul preached to them, and, intending to depart on the morrow, he continued his discourse till midnight. Then, after describing the accident and the healing, which was the occasion of the narrative, he goes straight on: "And having come up again, and having broken bread and eaten, and having conversed with them till the dawn, Paul departed."

Now it is plain to any impartial reader of this narrative who knows anything of the other evidences concerning the early Church, that this was a public Sunday service in commemoration of the Supper of the Lord, and that the "breaking of bread" was the characteristic central act, to which St. Paul's sermon was leading up, and which, after the startling interruption, he completed in due form.

Apart from any question of biblical inspiration, it is not possible to escape from the clear meaning (as a matter of history) of certain passages of the Epistles, such as the tenth and eleventh chapters of the first letter to the Corinthians, admittedly one of the earliest documents of the Church. It is a sermon against certain laxities, first as to the temple meats, and then as to the misuse of the "Agape," the Love Feast, combined, as is well known, with the special celebration of the Supper. The whole passage is charged with forms of expression and turns of thought which evidently refer to the sacramental conception of the Mass as we hold it now. After recalling those types of the sacraments of Christianity which he found in the history of his own people, he tells his followers, as the very reason why they may not be partakers of the table of the heathen gods, that they are already partakers of "that one Bread"—"the bread which we break," as he calls it—"which is the communion of the body of Christ." That "bread" is *their* sacred sacrifice, and they dare not hold it so lightly as to let it be supposed that the heathen travesty of sacrifice to Aphrodite and the rest was otherwise than an abhorrence in their eyes.

In the eleventh chapter he is still more explicit. His warrant for complaining of such unseemly things as happened when they "came together for the eating of the Lord's Supper" is no other (as he tells them) than the *very words* of Christ's institution, which he repeats in full. "I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you, that the same night in which He was betrayed He took bread, and when He had given thanks He brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is My body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me." He tells them in plain words that "as often as they eat this bread and drink this cup they are showing forth the death of the Lord," and he warns them that if they take part therein "unworthily"—if each man does not first prove, examine, essay himself, to see that he is void of grave offence, and "so eat that bread"—then they shall be "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," and it shall bring the uttermost judgments upon them.

I can only indicate the Pauline argument, but every line and word of it strengthens the conclusion that he is referring to an Apostolic archetype of our office of the Mass, and to nothing else. Less distinctly, but with equal truth, the same thing may be said of the argument of the unique Epistle to the Hebrews, of which the keynote is the insistence on the "priesthood according to the order of Melchisedek," who offered the bread and wine. I venture to affirm that if there were no other historic testimony for the Mass than that which is to be found within the canon of the New Testament, it would be enough. We do not find any direct account of the liturgical form. The texts we have do not deal with such matters. Yet, even as to this, there is in the same passage of the Corinthians a significant phrase. The graver abuses he has attacked they will themselves, he is confident, put away; "the rest," he adds, "I will myself *put in order* when I come." He will regulate, he means, the manner of

their observance, that all things may be done, as Clement put it, "decently and in order." We cannot, in the face of the surrounding evidence, doubt that such a settled order did arise. There is thought to be further reference to it in the second chapter to Timothy, and in parts of the Book of the Revelation. It has even been plausibly maintained by some of the best scholars that at least one passage in the Epistles is itself a quotation from one of the ancient liturgies.

In my former address, when I could not foresee that I should be asked to deliver a special lecture on "The Mass," I referred to some part of the remarkable evidence for the "Isapostolic" character of the office as a whole, which is afforded by a comparison of the most ancient variants of the Liturgy among themselves, and by the concurrent testimony of the earliest writings, Christian or Pagan, which deal with the matter. Before I revert to that branch of the subject now, it will be well that I should try to state to you in a few words what the office of the Mass in fact contains.

The Liturgies, in spite of wide apparent variation, proceed upon a scheme which is common, speaking broadly, to them all; and in describing that, I shall be describing with sufficient accuracy the Mass which is celebrated in every Catholic Church to-day. We may say that it consists, if we reduce the Liturgies to their simplest terms, of the actual Commemoration, called the "Canon of the Mass," preceded by a double introduction, of which the first part is known as the "Mass of the Catechumens," as distinguished from the "Mass of the Faithful." The central and essential rite was called the Canon because of its invariableness. It is in substance, and even in much of its diction, alike in all the varying Liturgies. The other sections, being far less important, were to some extent subject to the discretion of Bishops, and have undergone local variation and substitution, though even in them we find a wonderful conformity.

The Office of the Catechumens (called "Missa" because it ended in their dismissal) is a public service, not especially eucharistic in its character. It begins with the "Introit"—the Solemn Entrance of the officiating Bishop or Priest with his attendants, who chant an introductory Psalm. Then come certain very ancient hymns. In the West, they are that triple cry for mercy called the "Kyrie Eleison," and the "Gloria," or Hymn of the Nativity, first peculiar to Christmas Day (but so used before 139 A.D., as it is said), and then extended to ordinary Sundays. In the East, you have the equally ancient "Trisagion." Next come the public prayers—the "gathered-up" petitions of the Church—which were named "Collecta" in the West, and *Συνάγωγη* in the East, and have come to be variable with us according to the day. Then the Priest reads portions of the Scripture—an Epistle or Lesson symbolic of the Old Law, and the Gospel setting forth the New. Between these, as the procession carrying with joy the Sacred Book passed along the steps of the altar, a processional chant called a "Tract," "Sequence," or "Gradual," was sung, which is the

origin of many of those great Latin hymns that all the ages have borrowed. After the Reading comes the Sermon, upon the close of which the Catechumens were dismissed (as St. Augustine expressly tells us), and the "Mass of the Faithful" began. That was, of course, the "*mysterium*" which the Romans of the third century jested at—the rite at which the "initiated" only might be present.

This secondary introduction has undergone more changes than any other part of the service. So far as we have gone, you can trace a distinct parallelism between the common Roman Mass, or "Western Rite," and the Liturgies of the East. Every Church took leave to add and amplify and modify to some extent, yet we can see very clearly through the whole the outlines of an original common plan—developed, as we cannot doubt, from the simple use, whatever it was, which led up to the long sermon that Paul preached at Troas. Though the coincidences are obviously not accidental, there is in the scheme itself a simplicity which argues strongly for its antiquity. The Solemn Entrance, the Traditional Hymns, the Collects, the Reading from the Old Testament, the Procession of the Book and the Reading of the Gospel, the Expository Sermon, and then the Dismissal of the Uninstructed,—what could be a more natural rite?

In the following section there is still a correspondence, though the original scheme has, for reasons unknown, become obscured by frequent transpositions. It probably began with a second "Entrance" of the officiating clergy, bringing in the bread and wine, which they presented forthwith, in what we still call the "Offertory," at the altar. A survival of this solemnity may be seen in the full Roman ritual at the chanting of the Creed. This, the public profession of faith by the baptized Christians who remained, is a common use in all the Churches. As is well known, it was made more exact in its wording about 325 A.D., but it is understood that the simple "Apostles' Creed" was the original formula used in this place, and received its name from that fact. After the Offertory—which is now only a short extract from the Psalms—follows the preparation by the Priest of the vessels he is about to use in the Canon, which is closed by the public washing of his hands, at the psalm "*Lavabo*." How old even the bare ceremonial is may be gathered from the fact that this very rite is accurately described by Cyril of Jerusalem, and is explained by him, as by all of us to-day, as a symbol of the purity requisite for the performance of the act that is to follow. Then after certain variable prayers, which are similar to Collects, but from being said in a low voice are called "*Secreta*," we reach that which has always been known as the "Preface" of the Commemoration itself. There is, however, another observance I should first mention, though it comes much later in the Roman ritual. That is the "Kiss of Peace" which was anciently exchanged by all the faithful in token of reconciliation, before they should "offer their gift at the altar," as Cyril says. In his use it followed the *Lavabo*—in others it followed or preceded the Creed—in ours it is exchanged at the singing of the "*Agnus*

their observance, that all things may be done, as Clement put it, "decently and in order." We cannot, in the face of the surrounding evidence, doubt that such a settled order did arise. There is thought to be further reference to it in the second chapter to Timothy, and in parts of the Book of the Revelation. It has even been plausibly maintained by some of the best scholars that at least one passage in the Epistles is itself a quotation from one of the ancient liturgies.

In my former address, when I could not foresee that I should be asked to deliver a special lecture on "The Mass," I referred to some part of the remarkable evidence for the "Isapostolic" character of the office as a whole, which is afforded by a comparison of the most ancient variants of the Liturgy among themselves, and by the concurrent testimony of the earliest writings, Christian or Pagan, which deal with the matter. Before I revert to that branch of the subject now, it will be well that I should try to state to you in a few words what the office of the Mass in fact contains.

The Liturgies, in spite of wide apparent variation, proceed upon a scheme which is common, speaking broadly, to them all; and in describing that, I shall be describing with sufficient accuracy the Mass which is celebrated in every Catholic Church to-day. We may say that it consists, if we reduce the Liturgies to their simplest terms, of the actual Commemoration, called the "Canon of the Mass," preceded by a double introduction, of which the first part is known as the "Mass of the Catechumens," as distinguished from the "Mass of the Faithful." The central and essential rite was called the Canon because of its invariableness. It is in substance, and even in much of its diction, alike in all the varying Liturgies. The other sections, being far less important, were to some extent subject to the discretion of Bishops, and have undergone local variation and substitution, though even in them we find a wonderful conformity.

The Office of the Catechumens (called "Missa" because it ended in their dismissal) is a public service, not especially eucharistic in its character. It begins with the "Introit"—the Solemn Entrance of the officiating Bishop or Priest with his attendants, who chant an introductory Psalm. Then come certain very ancient hymns. In the West, they are that triple cry for mercy called the "Kyrie Eleison," and the "Gloria," or Hymn of the Nativity, first peculiar to Christmas Day (but so used before 139 A.D., as it is said), and then extended to ordinary Sundays. In the East, you have the equally ancient "Trisagion." Next come the public prayers—the "gathered-up" petitions of the Church—which were named "Collecta" in the West, and *Συνάγη* in the East, and have come to be variable with us according to the day. Then the Priest reads portions of the Scripture—an Epistle or Lesson symbolic of the Old Law, and the Gospel setting forth the New. Between these, as the procession carrying with joy the Sacred Book passed along the steps of the altar, a processional chant called a "Tract," "Sequence," or "Gradual," was sung, which is the

origin of many of those great Latin hymns that all the ages have borrowed. After the Reading comes the Sermon, upon the close of which the Catechumens were dismissed (as St. Augustine expressly tells us), and the "Mass of the Faithful" began. That was, of course, the "*mysterium*" which the Romans of the third century jested at—the rite at which the "initiated" only might be present.

This secondary introduction has undergone more changes than any other part of the service. So far as we have gone, you can trace a distinct parallelism between the common Roman Mass, or "Western Rite," and the Liturgies of the East. Every Church took leave to add and amplify and modify to some extent, yet we can see very clearly through the whole the outlines of an original common plan—developed, as we cannot doubt, from the simple use, whatever it was, which led up to the long sermon that Paul preached at Troas. Though the coincidences are obviously not accidental, there is in the scheme itself a simplicity which argues strongly for its antiquity. The Solemn Entrance, the Traditional Hymns, the Collects, the Reading from the Old Testament, the Procession of the Book and the Reading of the Gospel, the Expository Sermon, and then the Dismissal of the Uninstructed,—what could be a more natural rite?

In the following section there is still a correspondence, though the original scheme has, for reasons unknown, become obscured by frequent transpositions. It probably began with a second "Entrance" of the officiating clergy, bringing in the bread and wine, which they presented forthwith, in what we still call the "Offertory," at the altar. A survival of this solemnity may be seen in the full Roman ritual at the chanting of the Creed. This, the public profession of faith by the baptized Christians who remained, is a common use in all the Churches. As is well known, it was made more exact in its wording about 325 A.D., but it is understood that the simple "Apostles' Creed" was the original formula used in this place, and received its name from that fact. After the Offertory—which is now only a short extract from the Psalms—follows the preparation by the Priest of the vessels he is about to use in the Canon, which is closed by the public washing of his hands, at the psalm "Lavabo." How old even the bare ceremonial is may be gathered from the fact that this very rite is accurately described by Cyril of Jerusalem, and is explained by him, as by all of us to-day, as a symbol of the purity requisite for the performance of the act that is to follow. Then after certain variable prayers, which are similar to Collects, but from being said in a low voice are called "Secreta," we reach that which has always been known as the "Preface" of the Commemoration itself. There is, however, another observance I should first mention, though it comes much later in the Roman ritual. That is the "Kiss of Peace" which was anciently exchanged by all the faithful in token of reconciliation, before they should "offer their gift at the altar," as Cyril says. In his use it followed the Lavabo—in others it followed or preceded the Creed—in ours it is exchanged at the singing of the "Agnus

Dei" between the attendants at the altar immediately before the Communion. In every variant, its presence attests the constancy of the liturgical tradition, and links us not only with Cyril in 347, but with Justin, who described it before 150, if not (as Cyril himself believed) with the closing words of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

More remarkable, however, is the formulâ which comprises the so-called "Preface," the Responses which introduce it, and the "Triumphal Hymn" into which it breaks at the close. This singular and most striking group is to be found in *all* the liturgical families, and in all at the same point, as the immediate prelude of the commemorative office, technically known as the "Anaphora." Justin refers to it; Cyril describes it in minute and earnest detail, and preserves for us the startling fact that the very words of the Responses, which you may hear chanted in this connection at any Catholic Mass, on any Sunday, were so chanted in Jerusalem between 300 and 350 A.D. "*Sursum corda*:"—"Lift up your hearts; We have lifted them up to the Lord; Let us give thanks to the Lord our God; It is meet and right." So runs the ancient interchange, and the Priest, taking the word from the people's answer, goes on: "It is truly meet and just, right and available unto salvation that we should always give thanks to Thee." What follows—and here again the various Liturgies agree with one another and with Cyril—is a hymn of the Glory of God, which ends by making mention of the Angels and Archangels, Cherubim and Seraphim, and of the heavenly song they sing, wherein we humbly join—"Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God and blessed is He who cometh in the name of the Lord"—cometh, in very deed, in that sacramental commemoration of His sacrifice, which is about to begin.

The Canon itself may be divided into three parts—the Great Intercession for the Living and the Dead, the Eucharistic Commemoration itself, and the Communion. The tenour of the important words is preserved with astonishing fidelity here, although even here there is a curious difference in the way in which the Intercession is combined with the Commemoration. This variance is, in fact, the distinguishing test by which the critical scholar can say to which of the great families a particular local use belongs. In the Alexandrine the great prayer is before the consecration; in others after it; in our own, partly before and partly after.

Of the central Commemoration itself—the Sacramental words—and the Elevation, there is little that I can here say, except that in *every* rite they testify, beyond cavil, to the doctrine of the Real Presence. It is but a simple recital of the facts of the Supper at which the Mass was instituted, and of the command then given; and as the Church has always believed, the mystery of the Divine Presence comes to pass, and the miracle Christ wrought is wrought again, when the solemn words are uttered. Therefore we bow down, and adore.

It is this act of the Mass which the Church from the first century onward has styled the "Sacrifice"—the repetition, that is, by the provi

dential ordinance of the great offering once made upon the Cross. But there remains the Sacrament; and when, after the "Agnus Dei," a bell rings again, the Priest, having made his private preparation, receives that "Holy Communion," and with him any or all the people, if they will. With this the office is complete, except for the prayers of thanksgiving, and the final blessing. In our usage, however, there is read the introduction of St. John's Gospel, as a final theme of meditation. Other prayers, English or Latin, may be added at the end, or at the beginning, or before the sermon; but with these exceptions, the stated course of the ritual is followed by the officiating Priest, the people being free to use their own prayers, so long as they in spirit and intention "assist at" or follow the action.

In reverting, after this description, to the historical question, I need not refer further to the internal evidence afforded by the consensus of the early rites. The force of that line of argument will already be apparent, and any candid critic can easily follow it out. As to the external evidence to be drawn from the writers of the first four centuries (including Justin and Cyril), my proposition is that, differing as they do in race, character, and subject, no fair-minded reader can collate the numerous utterances which bear on the central office of the Christian Church as they knew it, without admitting that it was in its essentials such a service as the Mass I have described.

It would be impossible, within any practicable limits, to marshal these testimonies. By way of illustration, however, I may be allowed to direct attention to one or two indications of detail—internal and external—which point very strongly to the Apostolic age.

It is known that the liturgical texts were not committed to writing till the fourth century. St. Basil, when he wrote out his own liturgy, was himself struck, as he indicates, by the singular fact that, at the most vital and most carefully guarded portion of the office,—the words of institution,—the liturgical tradition did *not* follow the written texts of the Gospels and Epistles which had for centuries been the common possession of the Church. He explains that in that matter the Church had not referred herself to the written words, because "there are many points most important for the mystery which we receive (from the Apostles) by unwritten tradition, in addition to those which the Gospels relate."

And even if we had not his weighty testimony, it is very plain, on a mere comparison of the texts, that in spite of their necessary veneration for and dependence on the origin and charter of the rite, no one of the ancient types followed the formula of any Gospel. Evidently they claimed for themselves a co-equal or even a superior authority, as regards the events of that momentous Supper.

It comes out in many ways. The liturgy of St. James, which is probably the nearest of all we possess to the archetype, gives us the words *in the first person*, meaning apparently that James himself is speaking. The texts

of the Gospels vary as to whether Christ spoke of "My body which is broken," or "My body which is given." The liturgy of St. James vouches that He said *both*. Almost all the rites are particular to say that when He invoked the Eucharistic blessing Christ "raised His eyes to heaven"—not to be found in the Bible—and apparently therefore a traditional detail. But the most curious fact is that practically all the rites concur in the ceremony of "mixing water with the wine"—of which there is no word in the Bible. Their tradition as to this detail of Christ's action was so strong that they regarded it as an essential part of the rubric of the commemoration. And St. Cyprian, discussing (not long after A.D. 200) this very question of form, asserts that he upheld it because it was the tradition of the Apostles as to that act of Christ which they were commanded to repeat.

Now, as I have before proved, such matters cannot conceivably have been copied by any one of the liturgical families from another. There is no common centre, after the Apostles, on which they can be supposed to converge. If then such minute matters were preserved and handed down concurrently in each, they can have come only from the scrupulous care of those who saw and heard the great act, and themselves directed the manner of its commemoration.

As for early testimonies, they come to us from every side. Pliny's inept account to Trajan of the worship of the despised sect confirms, as do all the other Roman travesties, the internal and very accurate account we have from Justin Martyr. Pliny uses the word "sacrament," though he does not know its meaning. Justin even uses the word "sacrifice."

Irenæus is not very far removed from the Apostles, and his writings teem with allusions to the doctrine of the Real Presence; but he gives us even a stronger piece of evidence than his own, for he tells us in distinct and very technical terms how the heretic Marcus, whom he was attacking, had himself retained, though in a perverted form, the Mass and the Real Presence, so that he professed to make the wine show as red blood in the cup after his words of invocation. Why should a heretic of the second century have carried away these things, even in his revolt, if they were not then one of the essentials of the Apostolic faith?

I mentioned before the minute account of the then ritual of Jerusalem in the catechism of Cyril, written about 347-48 A.D.; and I cannot now dwell, as I would wish to do, on the extraordinary strength of the argument as to the antiquity even of the minutiae of the office I have described, which we derive from this and from the far earlier account of Justin. Even in the Mass known to the latter—not long after 100—we can distinguish the Entrance, the Offertory, the Preface, the Eucharistic Prayer, and the Formula of Institution, the Exclusion of the Catechumens, the Communion of the presiding priest and of the people, and the explicit doctrine of the Real Presence. What stronger evidence need we require to prove that the tenor of the Mass was in existence, as the accepted Christian ritual, a few years after the death of John?

One further point I would wish to mention, and with it I will leave this argument. I have mentioned the Prayer of the Great Intercession. St. Cyril, in 347, refers to it, and he mentions a number of topics which it then embraced. All these, as a matter of fact, are found in every one of the Liturgies. But that form of prayer has lately been found, by a fortunate accident, to be far older than Cyril. Clement of Rome, who is named by St. Paul in the unquestioned Epistles, and who was undoubtedly in authority at Rome soon afterwards, is given as the author of several Epistles and other matters which were not included in the Canon, though they are probably more ancient than some parts of it. This is not the place to discuss the authenticity of texts: but I think the scholars agree that certain hitherto unknown fragments of an undoubtedly genuine Clementine text have recently been recovered; and these are found to contain an extract from this very portion of the Liturgy, which, therefore, was then in use and honour. Their wording is found to be the same, so far as it goes, as that which is preserved to us in the texts of the Liturgy used at Alexandria, and ascribed to the tradition of the Evangelist St. Mark. Here then is a witness that cannot be tampered with; and the voice of this fragment, buried for near eighteen centuries, joins with all the other voices in proclaiming that the Liturgy of to-day is as old as the Apostles.

So far I have been seeking to make clear to you the basis, the tenor, and the history of the Mass.

To each of the great institutions of the world there belongs a philosophy, a group of antecedent ideas which it pre-supposes, embodies, and translates into the actualities of life; and a utility, a range of ends subserved, a scope of human needs fulfilled, a tale of the world's work done. In the former, the critical thinker will seek the inner logic of the historic fact. By the latter, the practical man will appraise, too often rashly, the right of that which is to be preserved.

Let me ask then at once, what is the philosophy of religion which underlies and is involved in the unique institution with which I have to deal?

The fact of knowledge, the existence of ethics, the possibility of political or social life,—all these involve, as all who are familiar with Kant's fundamental arguments will allow, certain ideas as the antecedent conditions of their possibility. So also does the existence of religion. I do not seek, however, to analyse religion; I can only ask you, for purposes of elucidation, to permit me to set out at once those broad general ideas which are here implied in that expression of religion with which I have to deal.

Of these, I distinguish four: *the need of prayer, the fitness of worship, the craving for a Divine communion*, and, above all, *the realisation of the personal presence of God*.

These form what I may call the abstract basis of the Mass, apart from that dogmatic aspect of it which I have already referred to as the public profession of a Catholic faith, the commemoration of the death of Christ, the fulfilment of His last behest, and the mystical renewal of His sacrifice.

of the Gospels vary as to whether Christ spoke of "My body which is broken," or "My body which is given." The liturgy of St. James vouches that He said *both*. Almost all the rites are particular to say that when He invoked the Eucharistic blessing Christ "raised His eyes to heaven"—not to be found in the Bible—and apparently therefore a traditional detail. But the most curious fact is that practically all the rites concur in the ceremony of "mixing water with the wine"—of which there is no word in the Bible. Their tradition as to this detail of Christ's action was so strong that they regarded it as an essential part of the rubric of the commemoration. And St. Cyprian, discussing (not long after A.D. 200) this very question of form, asserts that he upheld it because it was the tradition of the Apostles as to that act of Christ which they were commanded to repeat.

Now, as I have before proved, such matters cannot conceivably have been copied by any one of the liturgical families from another. There is no common centre, after the Apostles, on which they can be supposed to converge. If then such minute matters were preserved and handed down concurrently in each, they can have come only from the scrupulous care of those who saw and heard the great act, and themselves directed the manner of its commemoration.

As for early testimonies, they come to us from every side. Pliny's inept account to Trajan of the worship of the despised sect confirms, as do all the other Roman travesties, the internal and very accurate account we have from Justin Martyr. Pliny uses the word "sacrament," though he does not know its meaning. Justin even uses the word "sacrifice."

Irenæus is not very far removed from the Apostles, and his writings teem with allusions to the doctrine of the Real Presence; but he gives us even a stronger piece of evidence than his own, for he tells us in distinct and very technical terms how the heretic Marcus, whom he was attacking, had himself retained, though in a perverted form, the Mass and the Real Presence, so that he professed to make the wine show as red blood in the cup after his words of invocation. Why should a heretic of the second century have carried away these things, even in his revolt, if they were not then one of the essentials of the Apostolic faith?

I mentioned before the minute account of the then ritual of Jerusalem in the catechism of Cyril, written about 347-48 A.D.; and I cannot now dwell, as I would wish to do, on the extraordinary strength of the argument as to the antiquity even of the minutiae of the office I have described, which we derive from this and from the far earlier account of Justin. Even in the Mass known to the latter—not long after 100—we can distinguish the Entrance, the Offertory, the Preface, the Eucharistic Prayer, and the Formula of Institution, the Exclusion of the Catechumens, the Communion of the presiding priest and of the people, and the explicit doctrine of the Real Presence. What stronger evidence need we require to prove that the tenor of the Mass was in existence, as the accepted Christian ritual, a few years after the death of John?

One further point I would wish to mention, and with it I will leave this argument. I have mentioned the Prayer of the Great Intercession. St. Cyril, in 347, refers to it, and he mentions a number of topics which it then embraced. All these, as a matter of fact, are found in every one of the Liturgies. But that form of prayer has lately been found, by a fortunate accident, to be far older than Cyril. Clement of Rome, who is named by St. Paul in the unquestioned Epistles, and who was undoubtedly in authority at Rome soon afterwards, is given as the author of several Epistles and other matters which were not included in the Canon, though they are probably more ancient than some parts of it. This is not the place to discuss the authenticity of texts: but I think the scholars agree that certain hitherto unknown fragments of an undoubtedly genuine Clementine text have recently been recovered; and these are found to contain an extract from this very portion of the Liturgy, which, therefore, was then in use and honour. Their wording is found to be the same, so far as it goes, as that which is preserved to us in the texts of the Liturgy used at Alexandria, and ascribed to the tradition of the Evangelist St. Mark. Here then is a witness that cannot be tampered with; and the voice of this fragment, buried for near eighteen centuries, joins with all the other voices in proclaiming that the Liturgy of to-day is as old as the Apostles.

So far I have been seeking to make clear to you the basis, the tenor, and the history of the Mass.

To each of the great institutions of the world there belongs a philosophy, a group of antecedent ideas which it pre-supposes, embodies, and translates into the actualities of life; and a utility, a range of ends subserved, a scope of human needs fulfilled, a tale of the world's work done. In the former, the critical thinker will seek the inner logic of the historic fact. By the latter, the practical man will appraise, too often rashly, the right of that which is to be preserved.

Let me ask then at once, what is the philosophy of religion which underlies and is involved in the unique institution with which I have to deal?

The fact of knowledge, the existence of ethics, the possibility of political or social life,—all these involve, as all who are familiar with Kant's fundamental arguments will allow, certain ideas as the antecedent conditions of their possibility. So also does the existence of religion. I do not seek, however, to analyse religion; I can only ask you, for purposes of elucidation, to permit me to set out at once those broad general ideas which are here implied in that expression of religion with which I have to deal.

Of these, I distinguish four: *the need of prayer, the fitness of worship, the craving for a Divine communion*, and, above all, *the realization of the personal presence of God*.

These form what I may call the abstract basis of the Mass, apart from that dogmatic aspect of it which I have already referred to as the public profession of a Catholic faith, the commemoration of the death of Christ, the fulfilment of His last behest, and the mystical renewal of His sacrifice.

You will see, I hope, that the four ideas I have referred to arise out of the very essential character of religion, as distinguished, for example, from ethics or from poetry. Ethics is the side of life on which I stand related to an abstract, imperative, rigid law, a pitiless, infinite yea or nay. Poetry—indeed, art in general—is that phase of life in which I stand related to an infinite beauty, revealed in endless subtleties of unexpressed suggestion; an infinite that evades us as we grasp it, a truth that is so vague and unconfined that it is very hard to say when it *is* true.

Religion also is a relation between the finite self and the infinite, but it is distinguished pre-eminently in this, that for it the relation is always and above all things a *personal* one. That the attribution to infinite being of all that we mean, in any positive sense, by personality, is involved not only in ethics but even in knowledge and all else, is capable, I am certain, of strict proof. But neither in the intellectual nor in the ethical side of things is the *personality* of the infinite the prominent note. In the region of *intellectual life*, the infinite is *truth*; in the *arts* it is *beauty*; in the *ethical* world, it is *law*; but in *religion*, beyond and above all else, it is *love*. Knowledge may imply a knower, and law may presuppose a law-giver. But love cannot even be stated or thought of but as the love of one person for another.

In this we touch the beating heart of the universe. Unless you are audacious enough to seriously say that all the religion of the human centuries is a mere delusion and a dream, then we may appeal to the mere existence of religion as a fact of life in proof that the infinite distances are not a silent void, that in the tideless reaches of the past the seeing eye would find, not the blind onset of an iron fate, but the personal tending of a tireless care, and that the shut portals of the future shall disclose not death, but the living God.

If, then, religion presupposes and indeed *means* a personal relation between my personal self and a personal God, this relation must be evidently common to all men; and in every age, accordingly, it has presented itself in public as well as in private forms. By all kinds of men it seems to have been felt that public assemblies for religious observance were a natural need. What then should such a sacred office imply? I contend that, by the very necessity of the case, it must imply exactly those great elements which I have already named as essential points for every Catholic Mass. Each of these, therefore, I will ask you to consider with me for a moment

It must involve the element of *prayer*. If there were no such thing as prayer, religion would be an idle sentiment—indeed, a mockery. If I stand face to face across the universe of things with another Person who cares for me infinitely, and whose power is limitless, I will surely cry to Him in my need. Some access, some way of intercourse, is involved in the very thought of such a Godhead. We speak to Him and He will hear us. But there are those who ask, How can He answer? and they tell us

that the course of things is fixed by a beneficent and unswerving law. No one denies the cosmic order, nor the sequences of cause and effect. I am not talking of any such thing as praying for a miracle, nor do I need even to discuss whether there be such things : for there is scope enough for God's answer to our prayer without violence to any of the so-called laws which are the fetish of the lesser sort of scientific men. You do not prove by pointing us to causes and events, that Providence must stand aside and see the cruel wheels go round. I venture to say you will prove nothing against a rational belief in prayer until you go the whole irrational range of pure materialism, and deny all freedom of human action as well as of the Divine. Are any of you prepared to say the universe is but a gigantic mechanism? If you think you are, let me remind you that the theory will do more than just destroy religion. It will end at once all ethics, all effort, all ideals. It will reduce consciousness to a mockery, spirituality to a dream, and love to a chemical attraction ; and, after all, it will have explained nothing, but rather rendered everything insoluble.

No such wild hypothesis can be rationally described as the result of science ; and consistently with all we do know, I repeat that there is ample scope for our belief. In the first place, we know, as clearly as we know anything, that our action is every instant changing, sometimes on issues of enormous moment, the natural trend of the forces about us. A ship is driving on a lee shore. To a savage eye her wreck is an obvious inference from law. But a man's will, by a power of selection and adaptation simple enough to us, can turn the very engines of destruction into the servants of his design. So can God, we say, upon His greater plane.

Again, a thing of daily experience for us, as between the human lives we know, is the fact of influence. Exactly how the personality of a man or woman acts on other lives, we cannot pretend to say. But friendship and love, hate and help, rivalry and discipleship, we have all seen to spring into being, sometimes in a moment, for a mere nothing, a casual meeting, a passing word. A trick of feature, some subtlety of voice, or a so-called personal magnetism yet more impalpable, may bind as by a spell not only individuals but mighty masses of men. We see such things among ourselves. When we pray God for light and growth, for purity and healing, for help and hope and holiness, why shall not *He* act also in such ways of influence, in His far wider way?

We pray, then, in the Mass, as the Church has always prayed, for our own needs and for all the world's, in due obedience to the will of God. The element of general prayer—the great intercession—is, indeed, one of the main factors of that archetype of all the liturgies for which we claim an apostolic origin. Not only is it present in all the five great families, but its very tenor is in all of them the same, and in all it is connected closely with the central act—the repetition of the sacramental words. In all it takes the double form of a prayer, first, for all the living, and then for all the dead ; for to us they are all members of that body of Christ, which is

the Church. To us the life beyond the grave is not a fatal alternative of instant heaven or hopeless misery, with no world of growth and preparation set between. If by prayer we can help our brethren whom we see, then we believe that by prayer, if God will, we may help also our brethren who have gone before us—out of sight, indeed, but not beyond our reach; for they also are but another of the folds of God.

It is this great intercession which has survived in most of the Protestant religious services under one form or another; though in these its great significance as a witness to the idea of the solidarity of all the Church on earth and in the other world has, for some strange reason, been destroyed. But it is not on this venerable formula alone that Catholics rely for the element of prayer. In the Mass the ritual words are but the guides, and not the fetters of devotion. The whole course of the office is to the devout Catholic one long occasion for prayer. It is made intense and living by the solemnity of the action. It is assuredly not chilled, but rather constantly upheld, by the familiar form and ceremonial. Every movement of the priest and his attendants, every time a bell is rung or a salutation or response is heard, is but another warning to pray—eagerly, keenly, ceaselessly—using the moments well, for now is the acceptable time. The Mass has hardly begun when the Collects summon all to offer their prayers for the good estate of Christendom, for these are the *gathered prayers* of all the brethren. After the Creed, the offertory warns us to present our lives as a living sacrifice before the Lord, and to pray for all our personal needs. The ceremony of the "Lavabo" bids us pray for purity of heart and forgiveness of our remembered sins. Presently there are the so-called "secret" prayers of the priest, where we bethink us of our hidden necessities. We join in the great intercession, and we are taught to make therein a special mention of every personal friend, and every individual soul, in life or death, for whom, by any personal reason, we are moved to pray. Presently, raising his voice, the priest cries, "And to us sinners also." It is a call to his hearers that they should turn again to ask of God the helps that, in their sin, they need. A few moments more and you will hear again the lifted voice reciting the ancient formula with which the Lord's Prayer is ushered in; and all will follow it, for it is said aloud; and all will answer at the closing words, and join in that echo of them which comes after in the prayer against temptation. The "Agnus Dei" is yet another summons, and its cry for mercy, for acceptance, and for peace is echoed in its turn by the beautiful prayer for the peace of the Church, which leads on to the Communion. That past, there follow prayers of thanksgiving, and the Mass is closed.

Any one is free, of course, to read the ritual words with scrupulous observance, and if it be helpful to his personal devotion he does well; but every one is likewise free and is advised to adapt this course and movement of the ritual to his own soul's wants, and to his own best methods of spiritual expression. Therefore the Mass is never rigid, cold, inert, as

other rites have been where ritual was the beginning and the end. The whole great company of worshippers in a Catholic cathedral are doing but one thing—they are joining, and they feel themselves to be joining, in one and the same great act; and yet at the same moment every one is standing face to face in instant personal relation with the presence of God.

If it were possible I would have wished to indicate to you a few of the many common plans for individual prayer, called "Methods of hearing Mass," which are to be found in our various books. But prayer is not the only phase of that personal relation which religion means, and I must pass now to another form of it at least as universal. No one can deny the constant recurrence in human history of the idea of "*worship*"—that homage paid to the infinite Lord which we commemorate in the common use of language when we describe any religious office as a "Divine service."

If it be true that religion means a relation of person to person, it is also evident that that relation does not imply any equality of rights such as we expect, rightly or wrongly, in the relations of man to man. Freedom of one individual as against another we assume, and rightly, in our human conduct. For every assertion of a right to make me alter my own course for your advantage or desire must prove itself or be denied. Until you can show good reason to the contrary, I am among men my own master, and in right of my mere manhood, equal comrade of every man who breathes. But as between any man and the Divine, how vast, how ineffable, is the difference!

I observe that in the post-Reformation systems of thought, and above all in those American new departures of which Emerson and Walt Whitman are the true exponents, there is a strong tendency to suggest that there is something base and servile in the acknowledgment of any dependence of a human person—even upon the Divine. Some of these people talk as if they might shake hands with God; others as if it were a fine thing to shake their fists at Him. One of the most brilliant, and as I fear most subtly mischievous, expositions of this kind of human pride is to be found in Emerson's remarkable Essay on Self-reliance. Yet what utter nonsense it all is! One is tempted to cry out, like the sour sage, "How God must laugh, if such a thing could be, to see his wondrous manikins below!" If we are in fact face to face with a personality which is not one among other equal selves, but infinite—a self as against whom neither right nor duty can be predicated at all—a self without any possible selfishness, for whom all conceivable limitations are but as an idle fancy, and every imaginable power but as the lightest motion of His will—then our self-assertion as against such an one is a mere insanity. All ultimate goodness is and can be nothing but the adjustment of our personal volition to the standard of that one effectual Will. If then revolt can be nothing in the end but self destruction, it is merely ludicrous to enquire whether our

human dignity is injured by the act of adoration. As from Him we derive our being, it cannot be false to say He is our Lord. If there be any sense in which we can talk of justice entering into so unequal a relation, it is most just that we should do Him service.

The best reason for it, of course, is not that it is His due—for our refusal will hardly make Him poorer. As with prayer, so with worship also—it is for *our* sakes that we must lift our hearts to Him. It is exactly because the emptiness of human folly is prone to raise itself against the Master; it is because pride, rebellion, swollen insolence, are possible, that it is well we should remind ourselves of that eternal infinite disparity, and bow down and bend the knee. Not even of purity or truth did Christ so strongly speak as of humility, meekness, lowliness of heart.

Not that there are not forms of self-reliance and respect which are wholesome and honourable, nay, even needful for the perfect service of our God. If each man revered himself to every height consistent with all other reverence the world would be quickly purified. It is against the self-insistence in the face of the Divine that we protest. Because to set up our will against the holy will is the very mark of sin, therefore to worship is of the essence of religion.

I have seen the stout burghers of a Dutch town, assembled in their Groote Kerk, marching about with hats on, taking sturdily, to show that they disclaimed all figments of a reverent bearing. If their manner did not belie them, they were minded, I fear, to obey no more and no farther than they chose. To say that is to say they were independent centres of action in the universe: and these, like independent centres in our own or any other organization, are in fact a disease, and must work out their own elimination.

I fear that not a little of the common prejudice of a certain robust type of Englishman against the Catholic religion arises out of such a distaste as these Dutchmen, or as the typical John Bull of the past, would certainly have felt for anything in the way of worship which involved any very obvious abasement before a higher power. To the Catholic mind this is not dignity, but a monstrous littleness of soul. To us the acknowledgment of our dependence upon the Father as those "little children" of whom Christ spoke is a good and beautiful thing. We believe that they who in this sense are "poor in spirit" are "blessed," as the Master said; we confess our nothingness in the face of the Almighty love, not grudgingly but joyously; and every time that we are privileged to assist at the offering of the Mass, we rejoice in it as in a special and most fitting opportunity for the act of adoration.

It is to this ruling idea of worship that all our formal usages refer: a kneeling posture, a reverent demeanour; and all such symbols as the offering of incense, or of flowers and other precious things about the altar, which we think of as His throne. They are but poor attempts after the expression of that sense of reverence which it is surely our interest not to

lose. Ruskin said once that "in reverence lies the chief joy and power of life." The lack of it in the modern world is an evil deeper than we know. If you abolish the fashion and semblance of reverent worship in religion, where else will it survive?

Apart from symbolism, the note of worship is continued, throughout the whole office, by a constant recurrence of the poetic expression of the Divine praise. The hymn of the Nativity, "Glory to God in the highest;" the hymn of the Trinity, which we call the "Preface," with the "Holy, holy," that follows it, are in fact the earliest Christian poetry. Other psalms and chants of the like intent were added, as the devotional sentiment of the various churches ruled. You may think it is unmeaning that men should "praise God;" and so it would be if it were not that spontaneous expression of our gladness in His perfect majesty which is but the translating of our adoration into words. Your blustering burgher chanting formal psalms may be "a sounding brass"; but the humble soul, who for the pure delight of thinking upon God must needs proclaim His glory, is but joining, as our own Preface puts it, in the Heavenly Song.

There is yet another sense in which the Mass is charged with an intense adoration, such as must often amaze an earnest stranger. As the action rises towards its culminating point, you cannot fail to notice how the signs of waywardness, or vanity, or inattention gradually cease. Those who have been sitting, kneel—those who have been reading lay their brows upon their hands to pray. And when the warning bell has rung, there is throughout a Catholic Church an intense silence, a rapt devotion, such as I, at least, have never elsewhere seen. It is in that moment that you may see how reverence alone can solemnize and glorify the trivialities of life. From the squalid warrens of the poor, from the sordid worries of the middle class, from the idle vanities of fashion, they are gathered together—as of old—for the breaking of the bread. They have come to pay their service to that Majesty before whom all differences fade. And as the great words are said, the great act done, they are rapt beyond the little things about their feet, and are forced to look up, if it be but for a moment, at the mighty things that are eternal. In that great moment, even the least of His little ones may be glorified by the solemnity and the enthusiasm of adoration. The inspiration of high poetry and of glorious music is a noble thing; but for us there is a way of nobler inspiration open to the dull and the unlearned, at least as readily as to the wise, wherever a Mass is said.

The third idea which I set before you is the need of a *Divine Communion*. I know not, indeed, how I may express to you with any clearness what to us that word conveys. I have said that the idea of prayer—the access from our side to God—is inherent in the very conception of a personal relation between the Finite and the Infinite. If that is one side, Communion is the other. The sense of our dependence, which we express as worship, is not inconsistent, to the Christian, with the belief that

human dignity is injured by the act of adoration. As from Him we derive our being, it cannot be false to say He is our Lord. If there be any sense in which we can talk of justice entering into so unequal a relation, it is most just that we should do Him service.

The best reason for it, of course, is not that it is His due—for our refusal will hardly make Him poorer. As with prayer, so with worship also—it is for *our* sakes that we must lift our hearts to Him. It is exactly because the emptiness of human folly is prone to raise itself against the Master; it is because pride, rebellion, swollen insolence, are possible, that it is well we should remind ourselves of that eternal infinite disparity, and bow down and bend the knee. Not even of purity or truth did Christ so strongly speak as of humility, meekness, lowliness of heart.

Not that there are not forms of self-reliance and respect which are wholesome and honourable, nay, even needful for the perfect service of our God. If each man revered himself to every height consistent with all other reverence the world would be quickly purified. It is against the self-insistence in the face of the Divine that we protest. Because to set up our will against the holy will is the very mark of sin, therefore to worship is of the essence of religion.

I have seen the stout burghers of a Dutch town, assembled in their Groote Kerk, marching about with hats on, taking sturdily, to show that they disclaimed all figments of a reverent bearing. If their manner did not belie them, they were minded, I fear, to obey no more and no farther than they chose. To say that is to say they were independent centres of action in the universe: and these, like independent centres in our own or any other organization, are in fact a disease, and must work out their own elimination.

I fear that not a little of the common prejudice of a certain robust type of Englishman against the Catholic religion arises out of such a distaste as these Dutchmen, or as the typical John Bull of the past, would certainly have felt for anything in the way of worship which involved any very obvious abasement before a higher power. To the Catholic mind this is not dignity, but a monstrous littleness of soul. To us the acknowledgment of our dependence upon the Father as those "little children" of whom Christ spoke is a good and beautiful thing. We believe that they who in this sense are "poor in spirit" are "blessed," as the Master said; we confess our nothingness in the face of the Almighty love, not grudgingly but joyously; and every time that we are privileged to assist at the offering of the Mass, we rejoice in it as in a special and most fitting opportunity for the act of adoration.

It is to this ruling idea of worship that all our formal usages refer: a kneeling posture, a reverent demeanour; and all such symbols as the offering of incense, or of flowers and other precious things about the altar, which we think of as His throne. They are but poor attempts after the expression of that sense of reverence which it is surely our interest not to

lose. Ruskin said once that "in reverence lies the chief joy and power of life." The lack of it in the modern world is an evil deeper than we know. If you abolish the fashion and semblance of reverent worship in religion, where else will it survive?

Apart from symbolism, the note of worship is continued, throughout the whole office, by a constant recurrence of the poetic expression of the Divine praise. The hymn of the Nativity, "Glory to God in the highest;" the hymn of the Trinity, which we call the "Preface," with the "Holy, holy," that follows it, are in fact the earliest Christian poetry. Other psalms and chants of the like intent were added, as the devotional sentiment of the various churches ruled. You may think it is unmeaning that men should "praise God;" and so it would be if it were not that spontaneous expression of our gladness in His perfect majesty which is but the translating of our adoration into words. Your blustering burgher chanting formal psalms may be "a sounding brass"; but the humble soul, who for the pure delight of thinking upon God must needs proclaim His glory, is but joining, as our own Preface puts it, in the Heavenly Song.

There is yet another sense in which the Mass is charged with an intense adoration, such as must often amaze an earnest stranger. As the action rises towards its culminating point, you cannot fail to notice how the signs of waywardness, or vanity, or inattention gradually cease. Those who have been sitting, kneel—those who have been reading lay their brows upon their hands to pray. And when the warning bell has rung, there is throughout a Catholic Church an intense silence, a rapt devotion, such as I, at least, have never elsewhere seen. It is in that moment that you may see how reverence alone can solemnize and glorify the trivialities of life. From the squalid warrens of the poor, from the sordid worries of the middle class, from the idle vanities of fashion, they are gathered together—as of old—for the breaking of the bread. They have come to pay their service to that Majesty before whom all differences fade. And as the great words are said, the great act done, they are rapt beyond the little things about their feet, and are forced to look up, if it be but for a moment, at the mighty things that are eternal. In that great moment, even the least of His little ones may be glorified by the solemnity and the enthusiasm of adoration. The inspiration of high poetry and of glorious music is a noble thing; but for us there is a way of nobler inspiration open to the dull and the unlearned, at least as readily as to the wise, wherever a Mass is said.

The third idea which I set before you is the need of a *Divine Communion*. I know not, indeed, how I may express to you with any clearness what to us that word conveys. I have said that the idea of prayer—the access from our side to God—is inherent in the very conception of a personal relation between the Finite and the Infinite. If that is one side, Communion is the other. The sense of our dependence, which we express as worship, is not inconsistent, to the Christian, with the belief that

in another sense, transcending our imagination, we may be made one with the Divine. If you will read the intense chapters at the end of John's Gospel, or if you read any of the great books of religious utterance, such as the "Imitation," you will see that the sense of the Divine Love cannot remain for the religious soul a merely intellectual proposition. "Whosoever eateth My flesh abideth in Me, and I in Him:" "That they may be one as we are one; I in them and Thou in Me,"—such phrases, commonly described as mystical, are reiterated over and over again. And in the passion of the love of God, the great writers of the Church have delighted to talk of dying to themselves and to all earthly things that they may be the more lost in their Beloved.

These things are of personal experience, and to those who are without they will seem nothing. I desire now only to point out that the personal relation of each finite self to the Infinite Self which I have spoken of, cannot be thought of otherwise than as a union of love; whatever in the marvels of the Infinite such love may mean. This love, not merely of man for God, but of God for man, is of the essence of the Christian, as indeed of any, religion. Now of love itself, in any phase of it, what can we say? We have said and sung an infinite deal about it; but we can say little more than that it is a union of two souls, wherein in some sense their personal interests have fallen away so that they are to each another no longer alien, but as one. What, then, would such love be, if it could transcend our limits and be taken up into the Divine? We could not, apart from any revelation, have professed to say; but we may say without unreason that in such a conception we have a key at least to some of the aspects of the sacramental and mystic conceptions of the Divine Communion; of an Infinite Love, who gives Himself to us, whose delight it is to dwell with us, whose yearning is for our answering love, who makes Himself like to our lowliness that He may reach us and draw us to Himself; who can in truth, if we will love Him, be one with us and yet our God, as we can indeed be lost in Him and yet be none the less the personal selves He made

I cannot pretend to tell you, even remotely, of that hidden wisdom of the spiritual experience. None of you who have read the lives and writings of the Saints can doubt that it exists, and that they who have expressed it were uttering the most sacred truths they knew, for the truth of which they would have counted it a joy to die. You may think they are deceived, but that intense belief is a tremendous fact of our humanity, and has had and still has its immense results. There is, however, you explain it, a human craving for such oneness with the far-off Infinite; and in the Mass it has found, among all manner of men, its full and abiding satisfaction. The idea of such communion is, as you already know, inherent in its earliest plan, as it was the main idea of the Last Supper itself. In the primitive times, the actual reception of the Sacramental Communion by all present was the usual custom; but at an early date, for various

reasons, that ceased to be expected. Nevertheless, so strongly is this side of the Mass insisted on that you will find that all our books of devotion exhort the hearer, if he is not prepared for the actual reception of the Eucharist, to make at that part of the Mass the meditations and exercises which are known as a *Spiritual Communion*—that he may thereby take unto himself, if not the sacramental fulness of the Divine Love, at least so much of the sense and effect of that union with the present God as in his duller spiritual state he may.

The three ideas to which I have now sought to direct your attention are, however, all dominated by the last, which contains in itself the wide and fundamental distinction between the Mass and every other form of the public worship of God. I have called it *the realization of the presence of God*.

To all who believe in God He must of logical necessity be, in some sense, always present. But when Christ said that "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them," He was referring to the evident fact that for the human consciousness there may and must be a special presence of God, on those occasions when His children come before Him. Here, as so often in the Catholic Creed, we come upon the note of human solidarity. God is present to any religious soul; but where the brethren are gathered together—where the collective life of the Christian society is manifested—there He is, so to say, more fully present, and more near. It is good to pray alone, and to lift up the silent worship of the heart; but it is better, it is indeed a duty, to come forth and join with others in a social act of worship, in a common prayer for all the common need. For the Church of Christ is above all things an organic community, wherein none are isolated, none rejected, none sent empty away. The representative office of the Priest, offering the Mass in the name of all the people, absent as well as present, dead as well as alive, is itself the sign and token of this corporate character. The congregation—each particular *ἐκκλησία*—is but the representative of all the Church; and to each there comes, as we believe, the real presence of that Lord who has called the Church His bride.

It is not enough that one should know, as an intellectual proposition, that God is here. It is of much more consequence that one should realize it—that His personal nearness should be brought home to one's heart. We may know that a close friend is not far off, but that knowledge has on us a very different effect from the sound of a well-known step, and the hearing of a long-remembered voice. Now the one thing which, above all else, I venture here to claim for the great office of the Catholic Church is, that it brings home to us the vivid, palpable sense of "God with man."

At this point, however, the subject passes out beyond my reach. I have more than occupied the space of time appointed to me. And I could not hope, even if I delayed you far longer, to bring home to you what is meant in the spiritual experience of the Catholic world by the Sacramental

Presence. There are some things which it is not granted to man to utter at least in the ordinary ways of speech.

I will close, therefore, by pointing you for a moment to an entirely different, but not alien, aspect of the great office of the Church.

It has many forms and many uses, but in such a world as we live in there is one great use which should not be forgotten. It may clothe itself in the simplest surroundings, and yet do all its work for men. But in the ancient ritual and the ceremonial tradition there is an opportunity which the Church has always gladly used, of clothing upon it all the glory of architecture and of music, all the wealth of colour and of precious things which the devotion of the servants of God can offer in the highest act of their worship. You know, my friends, what an infinite impulse this very desire to glorify the place and the occasion in which the Lord came to His people, has been to Art in all the Catholic centuries. Until some such religious fervour comes again, your Art will strive but slowly. Do not say : "To what purpose is this waste ?" That which in the service of God is used to make more glorious the common worship of the people is one of the best gifts that can be given to God's poor. In many parts of the East End of London, as a Protestant observer lately said, there is no place of light and beauty but the Catholic Church. And what higher work can art and beauty do than that of the handmaid of a religion which is itself the solace and inspiration of the poor ? If I could go on to tell you what we know of the human uses which this office serves, I should have much to say of its utility for many kinds of men. But it is to the poor, whom He most loved on earth, that the fullest advantage of His great commemoration comes. You may do much for social conditions--you may redress much injustice and open many avenues of success ; but nothing you can do will compensate those who bear the misery of the world for what they will lose if you deprive them of a living religion, and of that great public act in which all that is hard in human conditions needs must fall away, and in which all that is glorious in human wealth is taken up into the glory of the Divine.

THE RELIGION OF DANTE.

BY OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.

NOTHING is more remarkable than the manner in which the reputation of Dante has developed with the new growth of national life in the kingdom of Italy. There was a time when, although his name was famous, his works were comparatively unread. Tasso was sung by Venetian gondoliers, and shared with the *Promessi Sposi* the honour of being an Italian text-book for studious youth. The knowledge of Dante was confined to the *Inferno*, and in that almost to the two episodes of Francesca da Rimini and Ugolino, the pair of unfortunate lovers who expiated their fault by being borne everlastingly upon a rushing wind; and the father who, murdered by the vengeance of an implacable enemy, fed in his last agony on the bodies of his children, who had died before him.

With the first flush of Italian independence this state of things entirely changed. I was privileged to witness from time to time the marvellous spectacle of the renaissance of Italy. I remember Milan before Magenta, and Verona before Custozza; Milan, when any citizen was liable to be roused from his bed, and imprisoned in a fortress without a trial; and Verona, when it was dangerous to speak seriously except in the open fields. I witnessed the rivalry of Cavour and Garibaldi at Turin, and read in the streets of Parma the half-hourly telegrams which announced the entry of the Italian troops into other marches. As soon as the Press was free, it teemed with cheap editions of Dante. They were exposed in every book-shop and kiosk, and were hawked about the streets on trays. The fever spread from Turin to Florence, from Florence to Rome, and from Rome to Naples. Dante was lectured upon to ladies, and taught as a classic in the schools. Undoubtedly this enthusiasm sprang chiefly from political causes. Dante was a Ghibelline—that is, in the great struggle which divided Italy between the party of authority and the party of local independence, he supported the party of authority. He believed in the subordination of the Papacy to the Empire, in the presence of a strong ruler who could quell the discordant rivalries of Italian cities, and educe order out of chaos: above all, he believed in the unity of Italy, that great cause which was then in process of consummation. Dante, in his first canto, prophesies of the coming hero, the greyhound who, disregarding the gain of money and territory, is to drive the wolf of the Papacy from city to city until she returns to the hell from which she sprang. It was a favourite conceit, which has not altogether disappeared, that the greyhound—the Veltro—began with the two initials of Victor Emmanuel's name, and that the whole

title might run Vittorio Emmanuele, Liberatore, Trionfatore, Re Ottimo (Victor Emmanuel, the Liberator, the Triumpher, the Best of Kings).

But Dante has not been without his revival on the religious side. When the leaders of the Oxford movement were leaving the Church of England, which they believed to be corrupt, for the Church of Rome, which they imagined they could purify, they studied Dante as the source of undefiled religion. In him they found, or thought they found, an orthodoxy unimpeached, a faith founded on reason and knowledge, unembittered by the theological disputes which followed the Reformation, and transused by passionate love of humanity and truth.

What then are the essential characteristics of the religion of Dante? How does Dante deal with what are the three necessary component parts of all religions—Faith, Hope, and Charity; which last more fitly bears the name of Love? These three virtues—the theological virtues as they are sometimes called—are symbolized by a cross, an anchor, and a heart. The heart is symbolical of Charity or Love, but in mediæval Italian sculpture Charity is figured by a woman who has not only her heart but her brain on fire, showing that real love, the true enthusiasm of humanity, must not only inflame the heart with burning zeal, but must set the mind aglow until it disregards the dictates of cool reason. Reason has no place where emotion is the guiding principle. The cross, the symbol of Christianity, represents revealed religion, the dogma which could not be known to us except by a tradition which is apart from and above the effects of human wisdom. There remains the anchor of Hope, that quality which, when the heart and the brain are on fire and the mind is lifted into the region of revealed truth, keeps the soul fixed to a sure and certain anchorage. This was afforded in Dante's case by intellectual knowledge—the knowledge of the world and of the universe, as far as it can be ascertained by human understanding; the realization of the past, the present, and the future of man; the lower life from which he has gradually emerged, the environments which surround and condition his existence, and the destiny which awaits him. Let us, then, study the religion of Dante under these three aspects. Let us consider in turn: of what nature was his love; what was his knowledge of the world and of man; what was the complexion of his faith; and, lastly, how these three qualities were fused together into a harmonious whole, so as to survive to future ages and influence a distant posterity.

Let us first speak of the origin and character of his love. The name of Dante is inseparable from that of Beatrice. Dante was born at Florence, about the middle of May 1265. He first met Beatrice Portinari, at the house of her father, Folco Portinari, on May-day, 1274. In the *Vita Nuova* ("The Young Life"), which gives an account of this absorbing passion, he tells us: "Already nine times after my birth the heaven of light had returned as it were to the same period, when there appeared to my eyes the glorious lady of my mind, who was by many called Beatrice,

who knew not what to call her. She had already been so long in this life that already in its time the starry heaven had moved toward the east the twelfth part of a degree, so that she appeared to me about the beginning of her ninth year, and I saw her about the end of my ninth year. Her dress on that day was of a most noble nature, a subdued and goodly crimson, girdled and adorned in such sort as best suited with her tender age. At that moment I saw most truly that the spirit of life, which hath its dwelling in the most secret chamber of the heart, began to tremble so violently that the least pulses of my body shook therewith, and in trembling it said these words: '*Ecce deus fortior me qui veniens dominabitur mihi!*' 'Behold a god stronger than I am, who in his coming will have lordship over me!' From that time forth I declare that love had lordship over my soul, which was speedily placed at its disposition, and it began to assume over me such authority by the power which my imagination gave it that I was forced to perform all its behests. Love ordered me many times to take occasion to see this youngest of the angels, so that in my boyhood many a time I went about in search of her, and saw that she had such noble and praiseworthy carriage that certainly there might be used of her the expression of the poet Homer, 'She appeared to be a daughter, not of man, but of God.' And although the image which always abided with me was the boldness at Love to lord it over me, yet it was of such noble power that at no time did it suffer that Love should guide me without the faithful counsel of reason in those things in which such counsel was useful to listen to."

Another story of a contemporary tells us of this marvellous and absorbing love. Dante, when he has related in the fifth canto of the *Inferno* the punishments of Francesca da Rimini and her lover, says that the tears they shed at the end of their narrative affected him so deeply that he felt his forces fail as if in death, and fell as a dead body falls. A note in the MS. of Monte Cassino, evidently written by some one who knew Dante, says that this experience befell Dante himself, and that one day, unexpectedly meeting Beatrice on the staircase of a house, he fell suddenly to the ground as if he were dead. Dante lost his father when he was ten years old; and his boyhood and youth for the next eight years were spent in severe study. His next memorable meeting with Beatrice was nine years later, when this marvellous lady appeared to him in a dress of dazzling white. She was accompanied by two older ladies, one on each side, and as she passed Dante in the street she turned her eyes to where he stood full of fear, and, of her ineffable courtesy, saluted him so virtuously that all the blessedness of heaven seemed open to Dante's eyes. This was the first time that he ever heard her speak; and the words came to his ears with such sweetness that he went away as if intoxicated with delight. He then retired to a solitary place in his chamber and set himself to think of that most courteous lady; and as he thought, there came upon him a very sweet sleep, in which there appeared to him a marvellous vision. There

appeared to him in his chamber a cloud of the colour of fire, and within this cloud was seen a figure of fearful aspect, who said, with much that Dante did not understand, "I am thy Lord." He bore in his arms the body of Beatrice asleep, wrapped lightly in a blood-coloured cloth. In one of his hands he held a burning heart, the heart of Dante. Gradually the sleeping lady whom he bore awoke, and the Lord of Love forced her to feed on Dante's burning heart, which she did with much hesitation. Then the joy of Love turned to sorrow, and weeping bitterly he went back to the heaven from which he had come, carrying with him the lady in his arms. Folco Portinari, the father of Beatrice, died on the last day of the year 1285. Beatrice only lived four years longer. Shortly before her death Dante had an illness, on the sixth day of which he suffered intolerable agony; and while he reflected—at one time on his weakness, and at another time on Beatrice—it came into his mind that Beatrice also would die some day, and this reflection greatly troubled him. Horrible dreams assailed him, in which women with dishevelled hair cried to him, "You will die," and other strange faces said, "Thou art dead." Then a fiend announced to him that Beatrice was dead, and he thought he saw a multitude of angels bearing her up to heaven with a dazzling cloud in front of them. The vision was so real that Dante wept bitterly. Beatrice died in very truth at daybreak on June 9th, 1290. In the words of Dante, "The Lord of Justice called that most gentle lady to glory under the banner of that Blessed Queen the Virgin Mary, whose name was in very great reverence in the words of that blessed Beatrice."

From the moment of her death Beatrice becomes more than ever the guide and loadstar of Dante's life. She is so transfused into his studies and his faith that many have supposed that she never really existed, but was a mere abstraction, whereas all the notices of her in the *Vita Nuova*, as well as much in the *Divina Commedia*, prove that she was really a creature of flesh and blood. As I shall show later, she was the stimulus to Dante's studies, and the purifier of his life. A year after Beatrice's death Dante married Gemma de' Donati, who bore him seven children. Beatrice was also married at an early age, but their unions did not preclude the deepest spiritual love. Let us trace some of the relations between Beatrice and Dante in the Divine Comedy. I need hardly say that this epic poem is the story of the wanderings of Dante through Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. Vergil, the great poet of Rome, was his guide through the first and second, Beatrice through the third, of these regions. But Beatrice was the moving spirit of the whole journey. Vergil tells him when they first meet at the entrance of Hell how a lady, beautiful and blessed, had called him with eyes brighter than the sun; and how she had told him sweetly and affably, with the voice of an angel, that Dante, her friend, but not the friend of Fortune, was so impeded on the desert stage of life that he was nearly lost. "Help him," she said, "with everything that can assist him, that I may be consoled. Beatrice is my name. Love

impelled me to speak to you, and sent me to you; when I return to Heaven I will speak in thy praise to the Lord." Beatrice does not appear herself until the poet and his guide, after passing through the pit of Hell, reach the earthly Paradise on the summit of the hill of Purgatory. Then as the car, which represented the Church Militant, halted with its attendant hosts "in the bosom of a cloud of flowers, thrown by angelic hands, a lady appeared clothed in a green mantle and a flame-coloured dress, with an olive cross over her snow-white veil." Without distinctly seeing who it was, Dante felt the power of the ancient love. The old influence which had pierced him in his childhood now struck him in the eyes, and made him weep. Like a child who runs to his mother in fear or affliction he turned to Vergil, trembling in all his veins, but that sweetest of fathers and best of guides was gone. "Dante," the lady said, "weep not because Vergil is gone; there is enough to make you weep without that. Look at me well, I am Beatrice; I am Beatrice. How did you dare approach this mountain of blessedness? Did you not know that here man is *happy*?" Dante cast down his eyes in shame. She then relates the story of their spiritual union, addressing the angels which surround them. "Dante," she says, "in his early life was such that he would have given wonderful proof of every righteous action. But the strongest soil, if uncultivated, often bears the most noxious weeds. For a long time I enchained him with my countenance; and by the light of my youthful eyes I led him in the right way; but when I changed my earthly life for a heavenly he took himself from me and gave himself to another. When my flesh had become spirit, and I was more beautiful, more virtuous, than before, I became less dear and less acceptable to him. He turned his feet on a false way, following vain images. I tried to rescue him by dreams and other means, but they were of no avail; he fell so low that nothing remained but to show him the inhabitants of Hell. For his sake I visited the gate of Hell, and prayed Vergil to lead him hither."

The manner of Dante's ascent through the various circles of Heaven is deeply characteristic of his absorbing devotion. He looks with fixed gaze into the eyes of Beatrice, and, by this power alone, he is raised from the summit of the mount of Purgatory—first into the sphere of fire which lies immediately above it, and then into the heaven of the moon. From this he passes successively into each of the heavens until he reaches the Empyrean. The face of Beatrice, her eyes, and her smile acquire fresh beauty at each ascent, so that when they reach the seventh and last sphere his mortal gaze cannot endure the exceeding light, and he is obliged to find means of tempering it.

In the *Convito*, the philosophical treatise which Dante composed, between the love story of the *Vita Nuova* and the great poem which was the crown of his career, he tells us that Beatrice is the type of Divine wisdom, and that in her face appear things which tell of the pleasures of Paradise, and that the place wherein this appears is in her eyes and smile. For the

eyes of wisdom are the two methods of demonstration by which truth is most clearly seen, and the smile of wisdom is the persuasion in which the inner light of wisdom is seen, although under a veil. And in these two things, demonstration and persuasion, is felt that highest pleasure of beauty which is the greatest good in Paradise. The lines which describe his arrival into this highest heaven are among the most beautiful with which Dante was ever inspired. He says that the remembrance of her sweet smile is as far above the heaven of his mind as the light of the sun surpasses the weakest eyesight. He has followed her, he tells us in his verse from the first day that he ever beheld her up to the present moment, but now her beauty transcends all his power of poetic description; for every artist has a limit beyond which he cannot go. He must leave the further praise of her beauty to a louder sound than that of his trumpet. "We issued from the ninth heaven to that heaven which is pure light."

"Light intellectual, full of burning love,
Love of the very good, full of delight,
Delight which far transcends all human sweetness."

"Luce intellettuale, piena d'amore,
Amor di vero ben, pien di letizia,
Letizia che trascende ogni dolzore."

After Beatrice has explained to Dante the features of the scene on which he gazes, and has concluded with a severe attack on Pope Clement V., she remains silent. Full of amazement he stands gazing at the vast amphitheatre of saints, and the multitude of angels burning with love, quivering flames of fire, their wings of gold, and the rest of them whiter than snow. Like swarms of bees they float up and down from bench to bench of the saints, giving them peace and ardour, mounting as high as the throne of God Himself to rekindle their flames, singing all the time in praise to God, who inspires them with love. Yet amongst this multitude of flying angels and in spite of the vastness of the distance, Dante can see that all these saints have their faces turned to the central point of all, which is God Himself. He sees the joyousness of their smile and the energy of their action. His gaze passes now up, now down, along the benches; and by degrees he becomes aware of the general form and constitution of the heavenly Paradise. He turns for a moment to his beloved guide to ask for some explanation, but she is gone. In her place is a venerable old man in glorious attire. This is St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers. Beatrice has mounted to her own individual throne in the heavenly place, and has sent him to conduct the poet to the end. He sees her in the third row from the summit, crowned with the Divine light which is reflected from her face; he sends her loving words of thanks for all the care she has taken in drawing him from slavery to true liberty, and he prays her to continue to protect him until his death. Beatrice looks at him and smiles, and then turns to the central point of light which is the source of all beatitude. The function of Love is over, that of Faith has begun. Love

has taught all that the mind can apprehend, what remains can be traced by intuition alone.

Such as I have attempted to describe was the foundation and the scope of Dante's love. Let us now see what were the grounds of his hope—or, as I have explained it, his conception of the world, of the value of human action, bad and good, and of the destinies which accompany it here and hereafter. To make this intelligible, I must give an account of Dante's cosmogony, his realization of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven—very distinct and precise, and yet full of symbolism.

Dante regards the world as consisting of two hemispheres—the eastern, in which we live, composed almost entirely of land; the western hemisphere opposite to it, almost wholly water. The central point of our hemisphere is Jerusalem, the city in which the great drama of the Incarnation was played and consummated. Things were quite different until the fall of the rebel angels. Lucifer, their leader, driven headlong from heaven, plunged into the earth—the western hemisphere, which was then a continent with the Garden of Eden in its midst. The eastern half was till then shrouded in sea. The West, in horror at what had happened, veiled itself beneath the waves of the East, which left the land there dry. All that then remained in the West was the island of Eden. Lucifer fell into the earth till he reached the centre of gravity, the middle point, from which he could move neither backwards nor forwards. The earth fled before him and left a large pit, the inverted cone of Hell—something like those great diamond-pits in South Africa, of which we see models and pictures—but reaching right down to the centre of the earth. The earth thus displaced rose under the land of the earthly Paradise situated just opposite Jerusalem, lifting it up as on the summit of a mountain, which forms the mountain of Purgatory, up the side of which Dante and his guide Vergil laboriously climbed. The base of this world is surrounded by the sphere of air, subject to the ordinary variations of heat and cold, rain and drought, storm and tempest. Above this is the sphere of fire. The boundaries of these two spheres lie at the dividing line between Purgatory and Ante-purgatory, just where the gate, guarded by St. Peter, admits souls stained with sin to the mountain of purification. Beyond these two spheres of air and fire—which, with the earth and water of which the world is composed, form the four elements—lie the nine heavens, each including the others, like hollow revolving spheres or the coats of an onion. The first is the sphere of the moon; everything beneath that is sublunary, or of inferior quality. The second heaven is of Mercury, the third of Venus, the fourth of the Sun, which in Dante's time was regarded as a planet, the fifth of Mars, the sixth of Jupiter, and the seventh of Saturn. Outside these comes the *Cielo stellato* (or, the heaven of the fixed stars); outside this again is the *Cielo cristallino* (the crystalline heaven)—the *Primum mobile* (the *first moved*) of Milton—itself, as the widest in circumference, moving with extreme rapidity, the source of the

movements of all the other heavens, which revolve within it with gradually slackening speed. Yet beyond this is the *Empireo* (the Empyrean), without motion and without limit, the dwelling-place of God Himself and of His saints. This is arranged in the form of a rose, surrounding a vast and gleaming lake, which is formed by the reflection of the original uncreated light on the edge of the *Primum mobile*, the angels and saints of God. The centre of the rose lies directly opposite to the earthly Jerusalem.

Thus much is necessary to understand Dante's conception of the world and of vice and virtue. We must now give a more particular account of the construction of Hell. This is conceived as a pit in the shape of a funnel or inverted cone. Just as the circles of Paradise become gradually larger and more intense in happiness as they increase in size, so in Hell the torment becomes more severe as the circles are contracted. The Hell of Dante, like that of Milton, is entered by a gate which is closed to none. It has remained unlocked ever since Christ, after His Crucifixion, forced a passage through it. Over it in dark letters is the following inscription:—

“Per me si va nella città dolente,
Per me si va nell'eterno dolore,
Per me si va tra la perduta gente.
Giustizia move il mio alto fattore,
Fecem la divina Podestate
La summa sapienza, e il primo amore.
Innanzi a me non fur cose create:
Se non eterne, ed io eterno duro:
Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch' entrate.” —

After passing this gate the wanderers enter into a dreary Ante-Hell, which is bounded by Acheron, the river of woe, the first of the four infernal rivers, counterparts to the four rivers of Paradise; the other three being Styx, Phlegethon, and Cocytus. On this river Charon plies his boat and conveys the souls across. Hell, thus reached, is divided into nine concentric circles; each being a landing-place in the descent, having on one side the wall of solid earth, and on the other the void of the abyss. The first circle is Limbo, of which more anon. At the entrance of the second circle sits the judge Minos. He is furnished with a long tail, and has a peculiar way of pronouncing judgment. Each soul as it comes before him confesses his sins, and Minos, as soon as he has heard them, switches his tail round him with varying degrees of vehemence. The sinner is sent to that circle which is indicated by the number of times that the tail of Minos encircles his body. The justice of Hell is very speedy. As Dante says in a line which imitates the quickness of the sentence—

“Dicono, e odono, e poi son già volte.”

Upper Hell consists of the first six circles. Below that is Nether Hell. Below the sixth circle is a fearful chasm exhaling an intolerable stench, in which the monster Minotaur, half-bull, half-man, prowls about; to it leads a terrible and precipitous landslip—made by the earthquake of the

Crucifixion. At the foot of this is the seventh circle, divided into three concentric rings. The first of these is formed by Phlegethon, a river of boiling blood. Within this is a wood of living trees, and beyond it a dreary sand waste, rained upon by flakes of fire. Below this again is a void of appalling depth, down which Phlegethon dives. Dante and Vergil can only descend by riding on the back of the monster Geryon—with face of man and trunk of serpent, apt emblem of fraud. We now reach the famous Malebolge (or evil pits), huge concentric ditches separated by walls, and connected by bridges of rock, in which different degrees of flame are furnished. After the ten pits of Malebolge we reach another steep descent, that which lies above the ninth and last circle. This is the well of the giants. Nimrod, the Titans, and the other giants stand towering to the height of about seventy feet. Their heads rise far above Malebolge, while their feet rest on the frozen floor of the abyss. Here we reach Cocytus, a stagnant pool, not a river, the pool of Lamentation. The fire is now past, and thick-ribbed ice takes its place. In this lower depth are punished the traitors; the four belts of Cocytus are marked by the names of the most notorious traitors punished in them. *Caïna* contains those who, like Cain, betrayed their nearest kindred; *Antenora* those who, like Antenor, betrayed their country; *Ptolomea* those who, like Ptolemy the Younger, betrayed their friends and guests; and, last of all, *Giudecca*, containing those who, like Judas, betrayed their benefactors and their masters.

We have now reached the centre of the world, the final period of all things, and in this is deeply embedded the monstrous form of Lucifer. He has three faces—that in the centre is red, the right-hand face is yellow, and the left black. Beneath each face two huge bat-wings flap with steady but ceaseless motion, causing the icy wind which freezes Cocytus. In the three mouths of Lucifer are crunched the three arch-traitors of the world. Who are they? I doubt if you would ever guess. The central mouth contains Judas Iscariot, the betrayer of Christ, who is not only marked by the teeth, but torn by the claws, of the fallen angel. The two other mouths hold Brutus and Cassius, the murderers of Cæsar. Thus, in Dante's large and generous survey of the history of the world, are Christ and Cæsar brought together: one, the Founder of the Church and the Suzerain Head of the Vicegerent Power; the other the consummation of humanity, the founder of the Roman Empire, the divine scheme for the order and governance of the world, the origin and suzerain of the holy line of emperors whose sword of justice and power Dante continually invoked to restrain and subdue to harmony the jarring feuds of distracted Italy.

Such is the form of Hell, as conceived by Dante. Let us now consider what Dante tells us as to right and wrong, as to the comparative goodness or badness of human actions in this world.

The moment Dante passes the gate of Hell, he enters a place full of strange and horrible sounds, groans, cries, and maimed accents of grief.

The dark air is swept by a mighty rushing wind, like the Sahara in a hurricane. Here are the miserable souls of those who lived in the world without blame and without praise, who did neither good nor ill in life. Here are the angels who took no part in the great struggle between God and Lucifer, which stood aside in their own neutrality. They are rejected both by Heaven and Hell. They have no hope of death, their blind life is so degraded that they are envious of the lot of all the rest.

"Fama di loro il mondo esser non lassa,
Misericordia e giustizia gli sdegna,
Non ragionam di lor ma guarda e passa."

"No fame of these the world suffers to be,
Mercy and justice spurn them from their side,
Take no account of them—gaze and pass on."

How withering the scorn! Dante was bound by his faith to punish them as he had been taught that they are punished. But he has his own standard. Better far the noble mind to suffer anything, the burning marl, the flakes of fire, or the pressure of thick-ribbed ice, than to be borne for ever in the ceaseless storm of wavering purpose, despised alike by God and devils. Two vices Dante hates with a supreme hatred—cowardice and treachery. The dark waste of the *Vigliacchi* is almost a worse abode than the mouths of Lucifer. The first circle of Hell is Limbo, a place of far less torment; it contains the souls of infants who have died too young to commit sin, and unbelievers who have guided their actions only by the light of conscience. They have no definite punishment, they wail not, but only sigh. Their only pain is to live ever in desire without hope. Indeed, many might envy the noble companionship of the souls that dwell there. As Vergil approaches, a voice is heard, "*Onorate, l'altissimo poeta!*" and four mighty shades advance to do him honour. These are Homer, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan. Vergil joins their company, Vergil, whose cry soars above them like an eagle. A little farther down, in a luminous spot, stands a noble castle, girt with sevenfold walls and encircled by a beautiful river. Seven gates give access to the castle court. The seven walls are the seven virtues, and the seven gates are the seven sciences. Here dwell the great ones of olden time: Hector, Æneas, and the great Cæsar, with his eagle eyes; and Saladin seated apart by himself. There is Aristotle, the master of those who know; all admire him and all do him honour; Socrates and Plato are seated by his side; Democritus and Dioscorides; Orpheus, Cicero, and Seneca; Euclid and Ptolemy; Avicenna and Averroes. The enthusiasm of the true Dante breaks forth in this description. He must have thought it no evil fate to be one of this chosen company. Although it is part of Hell, it is better than many parts of Heaven.

In the next four circles are punished sins of incontinence or want of self control, each form of it being stamped as worse as we proceed downward. First and least guilty are those who have sinned through excess of love. Dante is always tender to sins of this nature. The teaching of the Church

which places sexual purity above all other virtues, and regards it as the keystone of the good life, excusing all other excesses of the soul if it be sound in this, finds no response in Dante's judgment. Here are Semiramis, Dido and Cleopatra, Helen of Troy and Achilles, Paris and Tristran. Here, too, is Francesca da Rimini, who died by her husband's hand for the slip of one unguarded moment. Amply has this cruel vengeance been redressed by Dante's undying song. Worse than these offenders are the gluttons, drenched by the eternal, cursed, cold, and heavy rain; the misers and the spendthrifts, both equally culpable, throwing huge weights in ceaseless rivalry from one to the other; and worse still are the wrathful and the melancholy—the first tearing each other to pieces, and the second buried for ever in the black mud of the hateful Styx. After want of self-control comes what Dante calls bestiality, punished in the sixth circle—the predominance of the material above the spiritual elements in man, the failure to recognise the highest destinies of the individual and the race. Dante tells us in the *Convito*: "Among all bestialities, that is most stupid, inert, vile and most hurtful, by which any believes after this life no other life to be." Here, then, we find infidels and heretics. They are placed inside the city of Dis, a cemetery fortified with turrets and walls, garrisoned by demons, and guarded by fiends. Inside are tombs heated red-hot by creeping flames, open now, but to be closed at the Day of Judgment. Even here are noble characters. The great Emperor Frederick II., and Farinata degli Uberti, the chivalrous patriot of Florence, who, when as Ghibelline leader he had defeated the Guelphs at Montaperti and had so returned from banishment, withstood his enraged companions who would have destroyed the city of their birth.

Worse than the two offences of incontinence and materialism is Malizia, the pure desire of evil, which affects men in different ways, and from which all other sins proceed. This desire of evil works either by open violence or by secret fraud, and the second is the worse of the two. The seventh circle contains the three categories of the violent: those who have done violence to other men, to themselves, or to God. The circle of the violent is guarded by Phlegethon, the river of burning blood. In this river lie the tyrants, the murderers, and the marauders, drowned in the blood for which they thirsted in life, each immersed more deeply according to the depth of his wickedness. The suicides form a dolorous wood, pathless and impenetrable, the trees with knotted and twisted boughs, and dusky leaves bearing thorns which drop poison. The birds are harpies which feed upon the trees and echo the groans which come from them. Thus have those who deprived themselves of life changed their animal to a vegetable body, nor at the Day of Judgment will they resume the human form of which they deprived themselves, but it will be hung on a branch, just as St. Bartholomew in Milan Cathedral carries his skin upon his arm. Round the wood are those who from malice have wasted and destroyed their property, now chased in nakedness, hunted and rent by demon

hands. Dante thus adopts as the measure of sin, not its outward form, but its inward motive. The spendthrifts from incontinence were placed in a higher circle, and were doomed to a less bitter punishment. These wasters of their substance sinned through deliberate malice, and from want of self-control. On a scorched and scorching mud, rained upon by flakes of fire, a region which Dante and his guide do not dare to tread, lie the blasphemous on their backs, among them the rebel Capaneus. Here also, punished for another crime, is Brunetto Latini, Dante's master. Neither the gravity of his offence nor the severity of punishment prevents Dante from treating him with affection and respect. Conjoined with these, strangely enough, are the usurers, esteemed as breakers of a law of God in nature.

Between the violent and the fraudulent is a deep chasm, down which the fiery blood of Phlegethon falls in a cascade. Geryon—a monster, as I have said, with face of man and tail of serpent—conducts the travellers down this abyss : a type and embodiment of fraud. It is characteristic of Dante's temper that so large a space of Hell is given to the punishment of fraud, and that it is deemed by him as the blackest of crimes. Still there are gradations in fraud itself. We may deceive those who have no special ground for trusting us, or we may prove traitors to our kinsmen, our country, or our benefactors. Between these two classes of fraud a great gulf is fixed. Simple fraud is punished in the ten fosses of Malebolge. In the first are seducers of women, Dante, as we have shown above, showing a certain tenderness to offences inspired by love ; next to them come the flatterers, and then the simoniacs, who have bartered spiritual gifts for gain, a special place being devoted to simoniacal popes. Diviners, sorcerers, and witches occupy the fourth fosse, the heads twisted round upon their necks, so that they look always backward instead of forward. Next to them come the barterers who have sold justice and offices. Then follow the hypocrites, clad in heavy leaden cloaks and hoods, guilt outside with glittering gold. Then follow in their several appointed places, thieves, evil counsellors, and breeders of discord. Last of all are falsifiers, divided into several categories, as falsifiers of substance, semblance, and facts. The first are alchemists and coiners, the second those who have assumed the person of another for an evil end, the last malicious liars. The final or ninth circle of Hell contains the traitors as we have already described them. Here is found the well-known form of Count Ugolino della Gherardesca as he gnaws at the head of his treacherous friend, Archbishop Ruggieri of Pisa. The story of Ugolino was for a long time, with that of Francesca da Rimini, the best-known episode of Dante, and was regarded as the most characteristic type of his genius, the softer and more striking beauties of the Purgatory and the Paradise being left unregarded.

Such is Dante's conception of the actions of the world. Most vile and despicable are the weak creatures who can scarcely be said to live at all,

most infamous and most deeply damned is ungrateful treachery. Culpable, yet excusable, is want of self-control, most excusable that want of self-control which comes from excess of love. Strong is the division between sins of weakness and sins of malice, those which spring from weaknesses of will to do what is right, and those which are inspired by the will to do what is wrong.

We have lingered so long over this part of Dante's creed that we have little space left for the description of his faith. He believes the teaching of the Church of his time. Bold and soaring as his spirit is, he is not unorthodox. Purgatory, that vague region of theological speculation, so difficult to realize or to believe in, is represented by Dante with vivid distinctness. On the terraces of the mountain are punished the seven cardinal sins. The mountain itself is within the sphere of fire; its basement of craggy rock, rising from the sea, is in the sphere of air, and contains souls who are waiting to cleanse themselves upon the holy hill. Here, too, the crimes are classified by the touchstone of Love. Pride, envy, and anger spring from love distorted; sloth (*Accidia*), from love defective; avarice, gluttony, and lasciviousness from love excessive. Here, too, as in the Hell, lust is placed nearest to the earthly Paradise. The connection in Dante's mind between love and knowledge, and between that again and faith, is shown in the beautiful chapter which closes the *Vita Nuova*, the story of his love for Beatrice. He tells how, some time after her death, it was given to him to behold a beautiful vision, in which he saw things which determined him to say nothing further of this blessed lady until such time as he could discourse more worthily of her; "and to this end," he continues, "I labour all I can, as she in truth knoweth. Therefore if it be His pleasure, through whom is the life of all things, that my life continue for a few years, it is my hope that I shall yet write concerning her that which hath not before been written of any woman. After the which may it seem good unto Him who is the Master of Grace that my spirit may go hence to behold the glory of its lady, to wit of that blessed Beatrice, who now gloriously gazes on the countenance of Him, *qui est per omnia secula benedictus*, who is blessed for ever and ever." Thus the love of Beatrice leads to the desire of knowledge, knowledge in its turn leads to faith.

I must now conclude with a few words about the general aspects of Dante's teaching. Dante may be said to have concentrated in himself the spirit of the middle ages. Whatever there was of piety, of philosophy, of poetry, of love, of nature, of art, and of knowledge, in those times, is sublimated to a quintessence in his writings. His is the first great name in literature after the night of the dark ages. The Italian language, in all its purity and sweetness, in its aptitude for the tenderness of love, for the violence of passion, or for the clearness of philosophical argument, sprang fully grown and fully armed from his brain. The *Vita Nuova* is still the best introduction to the study of the Tuscan tongue. The astronomy and

science of the *Divina Commedia* are obscure when we translate them, but in their original diction are as clear as crystal. The reputation of Dante has passed through many vicissitudes. Read and commented upon in Italian Universities in the generation immediately succeeding his death his name became obscured as the sun of the renaissance rose higher towards its meridian. In the seventeenth century he was less read than Petrarch, Tasso, or Ariosto; in the eighteenth century he was almost universally neglected. Nothing is more strange than the indifference of Goethe for Dante, as shown in the writings and conversations of his later years. His fame is now fully vindicated. Translations and commentaries teem from the presses of Europe and America. Societies are formed to investigate the difficulties of his works. He occupies in the lecture-rooms of regenerated Italy a place by the side of those masters whose humble disciple he avowed himself to be.

The Divine Comedy is, indeed, as true an epic as the *Æneid*, and Dante is as real a classic as Vergil. His metre is as pliable and flexible to every mood of emotion, his distress is as plaintive and as sonorous. Like Vergil, he could immortalize by a single epithet a person or place or a phase of nature. Dante is indeed a better observer and a more faithful describer of nature than Vergil, whether he is painting the falling of snow in the high Alps, or the homeward flight of birds, or the swelling of an angry torrent. But under the gorgeous pageantry of poetic description there lies an unity of conception, a power of philosophic grasp, an earnestness of religion, which are entirely unknown to the Roman poet. Dante is too essentially a Christian to be fitly compared with a pagan poet.

More striking is the similarity between Dante and our own Milton. Yet it lies rather in the kindred nature of their subjects and in the parallel development of their minds, than in any mere external resemblance. In both the man was greater than the poet; the soul of each was "like a star and dwelt apart." Both were academically trained in the deepest studies of their age. The labours which made Dante lean made Milton blind. The "Doricke sweetness" of the English poet is not absent from the tender pages of the *Vita Nuova*. Better, perhaps, it would have been for Milton if, like Dante, he had known in youth an absorbing passion. The middle life of each was spent in active controversy; each lent his services to the State; each felt the quarrels of his age to be "the business of posterity," and left his warnings to ring in the ears of a later time. The lives of both were failures. "On evil days though fallen, and evil tongues," they gathered the concentrated experiences of their lives into one immortal work—the quintessence of their hopes, their knowledge, and their sufferings.

But Dante is something more than this. Milton's voice has grown faint to us; we have passed into other modes of experience and of thought. If we had to select two names in literature of men who are still exercising their full influence on mankind, and whose teaching is thus developing

new sides to coming generations, we should choose the names of Dante and Goethe. Goethe preached a new gospel to the world, the pagan virtue of self-culture, a sympathy with every form of human feeling, which declines to judge and which often passes into indifference. There is no department of modern literature or thought which does not bear upon it the traces of the sage of Weimar. But if we rebel against this teaching and yearn once more for the ardour of belief, the fervour of self-sacrifice, the scorn of scorn and the hate of hate which is the meed of the coward and the traitor, where shall we find them but in the pages of the Florentine? The religion of the future, if it be founded on faith, will demand that faith be reconciled with all that the mind can apprehend of knowledge, or the heart experience of emotion. The saints of these days will be trained, not so much on the ascetic counsels of the Imitation of Christ, or on thoughts which, like those of Pascal, base man's greatness in the consciousness of his fall, as in the verse of the poet, theologian, and philosopher, who is placed by Raphael with equal right among the conclave of the doctors and on the slope of Parnassus, in whom the ardour of study is one with the love of Beatrice—while both were made subservient to that burning zeal which lifts the soul from the abyss of Hell, up the terraces of Purgatory, to the spheres of Paradise, till it gazes on the ineffable revelation of the existence of God Himself, which can only be apprehended by the eye of faith.

OLD CATHOLICISM.

BY THE REV. R. S. OLDHAM, M.A.,
Rector of Little Chart, Kent.

I WISH to say a few words by way of Preface.

It seems to me that, from the Christian standpoint, which is of course emphatically my own, there is a special value in such a conspectus of the religious systems of the world as your Committee have sought to put before us. For, starting from the conviction that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is "*the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*" (St. John i. 9), we can thus see more readily how that Light has shone upon various peoples and various individuals in all ages. As we read of the 276 persons who were on board the ship which was conveying St. Paul to Rome, but was wrecked off the island of Malta, that while some swam ashore, "the rest, some on boards, and some on broken pieces of the ship," "escaped all safe to land," so we may recognise as made available for the moral salvation of the most diverse persons in every part of the world, fragments of the Divine Truth which is centered in Christ. St. Paul himself would certainly have done so. He knew intimately the heathendom of his day, and he told the heathen of Athens that he came to make known to them the will of God whom they already ignorantly worshipped. We have only to bear in mind that Christ is not the less the Redeemer of all mankind, because the larger portion of them have no present knowledge of Him. If they live up to such Light as has been granted to them, His redemption will avail for their salvation. And they may come to know this clearly enough when they pass into another world.

Then, further, it is assuredly a wise provision you have made, in arranging that all Lectures designed to explain or illustrate religious systems, past and present, should be delivered by those who write from a sympathetic point of view. It is only common fairness, that any system should address itself to us through the voice of a friend. Criticism may come later, and be useful enough then. But what is to be criticized should be the presentment of one who has himself felt the attraction of the system, whatever it may be. If there be Truth in it, it is well that that Truth should be arrayed in its fairest dress; and, if there be error, there will be the more merit in refuting it when presented at its best.

Coming now to the subject of my own Lecture here this afternoon, it might perhaps be thought by some persons a matter for surprise that it should have been included in your programme. For Old Catholicism is not a philosophy, appealing to the intellect, or fascinating the imagination,

and in either case all the more seductive because—as happens with philosophies—making but small demands upon the outward life and conduct. Nor is it anything novel. It is not attractive as solving moral or spiritual problems in new and startling ways. Its very name warns us off from any expectations of that kind. And, once more, there is nothing dazzling about it. It has not taken the world by storm, or swept large multitudes along with it. The Old Catholics number at present only about 120,000 or 130,000.

And yet I am persuaded that your Committee exercised a wise discretion—or, it may be, were guided by a sound instinct—in regarding Old Catholicism as deserving their attention. For on the future Church life of Europe it can hardly fail to have an important influence. Unless the universal belief that we are at present passing through a period of transition be an erroneous one, there will be much resettled by-and-by in European ecclesiastical affairs. And in any such resettlement the principles for which the Old Catholics are contending will certainly make themselves heard.

In the year 1870, a thrill of indignation went through the Continent of Europe at the result of the Vatican Council, held under the presidency of Pope Pius IX. It was felt most strongly in Roman Catholic countries, where the pressure of the new dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope would naturally be greatest. And as the terms in which the dogma was promulgated are by no means commonly known in England, it is perhaps well that I should quote them.

"If, therefore, any one says that the Roman Pontiff possesses only the office of Inspection or Direction, but not the full and highest power of Jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things pertaining to faith and morals, but also in those pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church spread over the whole world; or that he has only the more important share, but not the fulness of this highest power; or that such his power is not an ordinary and immediate one, as well over all and several Churches as over all and several pastors and faithful, let him be anathema."

And again: "We therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition of the Christian Faith from the beginning, with the approval of the Council, to the glory of God our Saviour, and in the interests of the Catholic religion and the welfare of Christian peoples, teach and define as a dogma Divinely revealed, that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, i.e., when in the exercise of his office as the Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, through his supreme apostolic authority, he defines the teaching which is to be received by the Universal Church regarding faith or morals, then, by virtue of the Divine assistance promised to him in St. Peter, he is invested with the infallibility with which it was the will of the Divine Redeemer that His Church should be endowed, in the definition of doctrine touching faith and morals; and that therefore such definitions

OLD CATHOLICISM.

BY THE REV. R. S. OLDHAM, M.A.,
Rector of Little Chart, Kent.

I wish to say a few words by way of Preface.

It seems to me that, from the Christian standpoint, which is of course emphatically my own, there is a special value in such a conspectus of the religious systems of the world as your Committee have sought to put before us. For, starting from the conviction that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is "*the True Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*" (St. John i. 9), we can thus see more readily how that Light has shone upon various peoples and various individuals in all ages. As we read of the 276 persons who were on board the ship which was conveying St. Paul to Rome, but was wrecked off the island of Malta, that while some swam ashore, "the rest, some on boards, and some on broken pieces of the ship," "escaped all safe to land," so we may recognise as made available for the moral salvation of the most diverse persons in every part of the world, fragments of the Divine Truth which is centered in Christ. St. Paul himself would certainly have done so. He knew intimately the heathendom of his day, and he told the heathen of Athens that he came to make known to them the will of God whom they already ignorantly worshipped. We have only to bear in mind that Christ is not the less the Redeemer of all mankind, because the larger portion of them have no present knowledge of Him. If they live up to such Light as has been granted to them, His redemption will avail for their salvation. And they may come to know this clearly enough when they pass into another world.

Then, further, it is assuredly a wise provision you have made, in arranging that all Lectures designed to explain or illustrate religious systems, past and present, should be delivered by those who write from a sympathetic point of view. It is only common fairness, that any system should address itself to us through the voice of a friend. Criticism may come later, and be useful enough then. But what is to be criticized should be the presentment of one who has himself felt the attraction of the system, whatever it may be. If there be Truth in it, it is well that that Truth should be arrayed in its fairest dress; and, if there be error, there will be the more merit in refuting it when presented at its best.

Coming now to the subject of my own Lecture here this afternoon, it might perhaps be thought by some persons a matter for surprise that it should have been included in your programme. For Old Catholicism is not a philosophy, appealing to the intellect, or fascinating the imagination,

and in either case all the more seductive because—as happens with philosophies—making but small demands upon the outward life and conduct. Nor is it anything novel. It is not attractive as solving moral or spiritual problems in new and startling ways. Its very name warns us off from any expectations of that kind. And, once more, there is nothing dazzling about it. It has not taken the world by storm, or swept large multitudes along with it. The Old Catholics number at present only about 120,000 or 130,000.

And yet I am persuaded that your Committee exercised a wise discretion—or, it may be, were guided by a sound instinct—in regarding Old Catholicism as deserving their attention. For on the future Church life of Europe it can hardly fail to have an important influence. Unless the universal belief that we are at present passing through a period of transition be an erroneous one, there will be much resettled by-and-by in European ecclesiastical affairs. And in any such resettlement the principles for which the Old Catholics are contending will certainly make themselves heard.

In the year 1870, a thrill of indignation went through the Continent of Europe at the result of the Vatican Council, held under the presidency of Pope Pius IX. It was felt most strongly in Roman Catholic countries, where the pressure of the new dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope would naturally be greatest. And as the terms in which the dogma was promulgated are by no means commonly known in England, it is perhaps well that I should quote them.

“If, therefore, any one says that the Roman Pontiff possesses only the office of Inspection or Direction, but not the full and highest power of Jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things pertaining to faith and morals, but also in those pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church spread over the whole world; or that he has only the more important share, but not the fulness of this highest power; or that such his power is not an ordinary and immediate one, as well over all and several Churches as over all and several pastors and faithful, let him be anathema.”

And again: “We therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition of the Christian Faith from the beginning, with the approval of the Council, to the glory of God our Saviour, and in the interests of the Catholic religion and the welfare of Christian peoples, teach and define as a dogma Divinely revealed, that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, i.e., when in the exercise of his office as the Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, through his supreme apostolic authority, he defines the teaching which is to be received by the Universal Church regarding faith or morals, then, by virtue of the Divine assistance promised to him in St. Peter, he is invested with the infallibility with which it was the will of the Divine Redeemer that His Church should be endowed, in the definition of doctrine touching faith and morals; and that therefore such definitions

of the Roman Pontiff are unalterable in themselves, and not by consent of the Church." (Chapters iii. and iv.)

Thoughtful men saw at once to what serious consequences this portentous dogma must lead. In large numbers of towns—more especially in Germany and Austria—public meetings were held. Resolutions and protests against it were passed. Even Governments were roused. It seemed likely for a time that national Catholic churches, independent of Rome—like that of England in the 16th century—would be established.

All this, however, passed away, for which there were two causes. First, the great Franco-German War broke out in that very year, 1870, and pre-occupied the Governments that were most concerned; and, second, the Catholic bishops of Germany and Austria, all the more distinguished of whom had strongly opposed the new dogma, both before and during the Council, not only, without exception, submitted to it themselves, but enforced it with the greatest severity on others.

It seemed therefore as though the triumph of the Jesuit party, which had brought about the promulgation of the dogma, were complete.

But there was a not inconsiderable body of priests and laymen who could not reconcile it to their conscience to accept as a Divinely-revealed truth what they had satisfied themselves was radically false. It happened that the Catholic theological faculty in Germany at the time included an unusual number of Professors distinguished alike for their learning and their piety. Döllinger, Reusch, Reinkens, Michelis, Knoodt, Friedrich, were great names; and the first of them was a man so renowned as an ecclesiastical historian, so lofty in his aims, and so courageous in character, that he seemed marked out at once as a leader, in whatever course they might adopt. After much consultation, all these and many others—notably the layman, von Schulte, the eminent Professor of Law at Bonn—resolved at all costs to refuse assent to the dogma. In a document that has now itself become historical, Döllinger declared: "As a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this teaching. As a Christian; for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the clearest utterances of Christ and the Apostles; it seeks to establish the very kingdom of this world which Christ refused, and to set up the rule over the faithful which Peter forbade for himself and all others. As a theologian; for the entire genuine tradition of the Church is absolutely opposed to it. As an historian; for, as such, I know that the persistent endeavour to realize this theory of a universal dominion has cost Europe streams of blood, has disturbed and lowered whole nations, has overthrown the best organizations of the early Church, and has produced, and nourished, and maintained in the Church the most grievous abuses. Lastly, as a citizen; I must reject it, because with its demand for the submission of States and monarchs, and the whole political order to the papal power, and by the false position which it claims for the clergy, it lays the foundation of endless ruinous strifes between State and Church,

between clergy and laity. For I cannot conceal from myself that this teaching, the results of which destroyed the old German Empire, if it came to prevail in the Catholic portion of the German nation, would at once sow the seeds of incurable disease in the newly-founded Empire also."

This noble utterance came to be virtually adopted as the manifesto of the Old Catholics on the subject of the Vatican decrees, not in Germany only, but also in Austria, Switzerland, and France. The die was cast. The threatened excommunication speedily followed, and included, besides the German leaders, the Austrian Pfarrer Cech, the Swiss Professor Herzog, and Pfarrer G'schwind, and the French Père Hyacinthe (M. Loysou), and the Abbé Michaud.

It has often been made a matter of reproach to the Church of England that she failed to retain within her fold John and Charles Wesley in one age, and John Henry Newman in another; and the comment has only too often been added, that the Church of Rome would have known how to utilize their services. The comment at least is an unfair one. At this time the Church of Rome lost her greatest writer, Döllinger, and her greatest speaker, Père Hyacinthe, to say nothing of the many other distinguished men whom she drove out along with them.

But all was not done when these brave men had defined their attitude towards the new Ultramontaniam. The more important task remained of exhibiting to the world their steadfast adherence to the Old Catholic Faith of Christendom. With this object, in September, 1871, a Congress was held at Munich, attended by more than 800 delegates, at which the following programme was formally adopted: "The retention of the old Catholic faith; assertion of rights as Catholics; rejection of the new dogmas; retention of the constitution of the ancient Church, with omission of such declarations of the faith as were not in harmony with the actual belief of the Church; reform of the Church, with such co-operation of the laity as was consistent with its constitution; efforts towards the reunion of Christian confessions; reform of the training and position of the clergy; allegiance to the State, in opposition to the attacks of Ultramontaniam; rejection of the Jesuits; solemn protest in favour of claims as Catholics upon the endowments of the Church."

It was natural that, in adopting a course so strikingly similar to that pursued by the English Reformers in the 16th century, the Old Catholics (as they had already come to be called) should enlist the lively sympathies of Anglican churchmen, both in England and America. And, accordingly, when, in 1872, a great Congress was held at Köln, it was attended by two of the most distinguished of the English bishops, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Harold Browne, then Bishop of Ely, afterwards of Winchester, by the Bishop of Maryland, in the United States, Dr. Wittingham, Dean Stanley of Westminster, and many other clergy from England and America. Having been present

there (by invitation) myself, I can testify to the great seriousness and deep religious earnestness which prevailed throughout.

By this time congregations had been formed in various places; and the most important question which had to be decided was, whether they should take steps at once for the election of a bishop. This was decided in the affirmative. In the course of the next year the clergy and lay delegates, after a solemn service at Köln, elected as bishop the Rev. Joseph Hubert Reinkens, Professor of Theology at Breslau, who was consecrated at Rotterdam on the 11th of August.

It was of course essential, if the Old Catholics were to be recognised as forming a Catholic Church in Europe, that they should obtain for their Episcopate an undoubted and unchallenged succession. And this they did obtain from the Old Catholic Church of Holland.

I should detain you too long if I entered into any details regarding the unique history (so little known) of this Church. All that is necessary for our present purpose is, to recall the fact that for the last 180 years it has maintained its independence of the Church of Rome, the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer still occupying the ancient sees.

Consecrated, then, at Rotterdam, Bishop Reinkens entered on his office. He was recognised as a Catholic Bishop by the Governments of Prussia, Baden, and Hesse; and a Parliamentary grant has ever since been made to him of the modest sum of £1,200 a year. He has under his charge fifty clergy, all of whom are engaged in active pastoral work, besides eight others not holding any cures. Last month he celebrated his seventieth birthday, amid the demonstrations of the unbounded love and veneration of his people. And what outsiders think of him we may learn from the words of the distinguished Protestant Professor, Dr. Beyschlag, who wrote thus of him lately: "If one may judge of a community by its leader, freely chosen by themselves, then there must be something Apostolic in Old Catholicism: so earnest and so amiable, so strict in conscience, so liberal in spirit does this man appear, devoted with so much self-forgetfulness to his thorny task, ever strengthening and encouraging others by his faith, which only grows stronger under difficulties. No lord over the people, but a pattern to the flock; ready for the conflict, when it must come, and a doughty champion against Rome, yet always devoting his best energies, not to strife, but to building up, indefatigable in his official duties, which entail journeys during nearly half the year, that he may confirm the young people of his congregations, yet finding leisure for scientific research—above all, a man of piety, of clear depth and genial warmth, a man of faith and love, reminding us verily of those venerable figures of primitive bishops who, of old, in the second and third centuries, represented the nascent Church in the midst of a hostile world." Let me add, that my own intimate acquaintance with him for many years enables me to declare that this beautiful picture is not over-drawn.

In 1876 the number of Old Catholic or (as they are there called) Christian-Catholic congregations in Switzerland had so much increased, that it became necessary for them also to elect a bishop; and the Swiss were no less happy in their choice of Professor Herzog, who was consecrated by Bishop Reinkens, at Rheinfelden, in September of that year. He is a younger man, full of life and fire, and marked by the same religious earnestness. He has fifty-seven clergy under him, by whom, as by all the laity, he is very highly esteemed. Of Austria the record is a very different one. There have been no great leaders there, and yet nowhere have the principles of Old Catholicism been more tenaciously held. Pfarrer Cech, at Vienna, and Pfarrer Nittel, at Warnsdorf, are models of laborious parish priests; and in Bohemia, some thousands of the glass-workers, whose products we so much admire in our drawing-rooms, are enthusiastic Old Catholics. But they are much kept down by their poverty. They are not able to provide for the support of a bishop of their own, and the Austrian Government will not allow Bishop Reinkens or any other bishop to visit them, even to hold Confirmations.

In all these three countries—Germany, Switzerland, and Austria—the Munich programme has been strictly adhered to. Whatever was primitive, both as to doctrine and discipline, was retained. The ancient creeds of the Church are firmly held; the old liturgies are still used, though revised and translated into the vernacular. Meanwhile, reforms were quietly but effectively carried out. The compulsory celibacy of the clergy was abrogated, and many of their priests are now married. Private confession was made voluntary. Indulgences were abolished, and the mediæval fires of Purgatory abandoned. Prayers for the departed resumed their ancient character. An incident may be mentioned which will illustrate this. After the consecration of two churches, last year—one in Germany, and the other in Austria—the first service the next day was a commemorative one, asking for members of the congregation who had died before the consecration could take place, Light and Refreshment in the world beyond. Transubstantiation is no longer taught, and the wine as well as the bread is given to communicants in the Lord's Supper. There is no worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The reading of the Bible is encouraged, and much care is taken with the religious instruction of the young.

All this bears (it will be seen) a very close resemblance to the course pursued by the English Reformers of the 16th century. And the Old Catholics, in the assertion of their Catholicity on the one hand, and their independence of Rome on the other, had the experience of the Church of England for 300 years to profit by. It was in their favour also, that of late the true character of the English Church, as Catholic without being Papal, had become more widely known on the Continent. For as far back as the year 1853 an Association had been formed in England under the name of the Anglo-Continental Society, the object of which was to spread information on this subject. A considerable number of prominent Churchmen in

England and America, both clergy and laity—among whom were Bishop Wilberforce, of Oxford, Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Wordsworth, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, Mr. Keble, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Beresford Hope, and Mr. Hubbard—had become painfully aware, not only of the ignorance but of the grievous misrepresentation of the principles of the Anglican Church which prevailed in Italy, Spain, Germany, and France, where at the same time a widespread dissatisfaction with the growing Ultramontanism of the Church of Rome was known to exist. They felt bound to do what they could to meet this by publishing, in the principal languages of Europe, translations of standard works, such as Bishop Cosin's book on "The Faith, Discipline, and Rites of the English Church," as well as original pamphlets and tracts on the English Reformation. The result was a much better acquaintance with the whole subject among studious and thoughtful men on the Continent, by the time the great crisis of 1870 arose.

The events which followed—culminating, as we have seen, in the founding of the Old Catholic Churches—rightly called forth an active sympathy between those Churches and the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Bishops Reinkens and Herzog have been welcomed as equals by English prelates at Lambeth, Farnham, and Cambridge; acts of intercommunion even have taken place, Anglican and Old Catholic bishops and priests receiving the Holy Communion together; brotherly love has been shown in the shape of material aid for special needs. And above all, at the Lambeth Conference in 1888, presided over by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Resolutions were agreed to by the hundred bishops who were present, which gave formal and authoritative expression to Anglican recognition and sympathy in every part of the world.

In 1889 an event happened which had much importance for Old Catholicism. A Conference was held at Utrecht between the five Old Catholic bishops of Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, which issued in a strict alliance, based, not upon a rigid uniformity, but only agreement in essentials. They have bound themselves to act together. And the experiment may be watched with much interest, because the genius of the three Churches is very different. The Dutch may be called Ultra-conservative, the German, Constitutional, and the Swiss, Liberal.¹ And if they succeed in working together, as the First International Old Catholic Congress at Köln last September seemed to afford much prospect of their doing, they may show the way to larger Churches by-and-by.

This points indeed to a direction in which Old Catholicism may yet render important service in Christendom. One of its main characteristics is a strong desire to promote union among Christians. Some sixty or seventy years ago the Roman Catholic writer De Maistre declared his opinion, that if ever a general re-union should take place between East and

¹ The Austrians are also virtually included in the compact, though (from their not yet having a bishop) in a less formal way. Their tone is Liberal.

West, the chief intermediary would probably be the Church of England. Should this dream ever be realized—and who shall say it may not be, for do not even dreams sometimes come true?—the Old Catholics will certainly contribute something to it. Sprung themselves from the very bosom of the Church of Rome, having already won warm approval from the Russian Orthodox Church, enjoying the friendship of the Anglican Churches, and treated with brotherly regard by a large proportion of the Protestants of Germany and Austria, they seem likely to have special opportunities of promoting reconciliation, of which they will be forward to avail themselves. As an illustration of the position they occupy in this way, the fact may be mentioned, that the German Evangelical Union, with a membership of 70,000 Protestants, has quite lately sought friendly relations with the Anglo-Continental Society on the very ground of a common sympathy with the Old Catholics.

But there are other principles also embodied in Old Catholicism, which entitle it to our consideration and respect.

1. It is the noblest stand for the supremacy of Conscience that has been made during the present century. And for that alone the Old Catholics have deserved the thanks of the whole civilized world. Few people in this country know the sacrifices they have made and the endurance they have shown. But for myself I can speak of these things as an eye-witness. For not only am I personally acquainted with nearly all their leaders, but in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria I have come often into contact with large numbers of them. And I know through what bitter trials they have passed, and in truth are often called to pass still. Nothing but the spiritual power which fidelity to conscience gives men, could have brought them through what they have had to suffer. The following is the independent testimony of the same Protestant Professor, Dr. Beyschlag, whom I quoted before: "Every intrigue, every social and moral annoyance and boycotting, every irritation in life and in death even, they have had to bear from their Ultramontane opponents, to such an extent, that, apart from the shedding of blood, which our laws in the present day forbid, it has been a true martyrdom." And another Protestant wrote lately, "The history of Old Catholicism, so far, is the history of the martyrdom of a small but noble band of confessors of the first and true Catholicism—a martyrdom which, as always in history, will be the seed of great deeds in the world's history, when only the time shall be ripe."¹ That this last prediction may be fulfilled is made the more hopeful by the remarkable patience with which all their persecution has been borne. For I can testify that they have followed in the footsteps of their Divine Master, "*Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not, but committed Himself to Him who judgeth righteously*" (1 Peter ii. 13). We may well believe that their discipline of suffering is preparing them for

¹ *Geraer Zeitung*, Feb., 1891.

higher things. And meanwhile their splendid vindication of the supremacy of Conscience must do good to the world.

2. Another essential principle of Old Catholicism is the recognition of Divine authority, as given directly to the State as well as to the Church. One of the most dangerous doctrines of Ultramontaniam is, that the Church has a right to control the State, and that the Pope may rightly interfere in matters of national social life, by virtue of some supreme authority divinely given to him. The Old Catholics reject this view. It is not, they say, in accordance with the teaching and practice of the primitive Church. We know they are right. St. Paul would certainly have repudiated any such Papal claim. When he wrote that "*the powers that be are ordained of God*," he was referring to State authorities. The point is, that their commission comes to them direct from God Himself. We are familiar with the recognition of this by all Protestant Churches; but the recognition of it by the Old Catholics, as coming from the Catholic side, has a value of its own. The Old Catholics, in other words, build their patriotism on a religious basis; and, as time goes on, that too may bear good fruit.

3. A third feature in Old Catholicism must also attract our sympathy as Englishmen. They have no quarrel with modern civilization. The Vatican has over and over again declared that to be evil; a stereotyped Mediævalism is to be maintained. But the Old Catholics teach very differently. They welcome scientific research. They are not afraid that science and revelation can ever ultimately be in disagreement. And they feel, as we in England do, that the task of the Christian Church is to meet the needs of our own time, and, if occasion call for it, by methods of our own time. Not to enslave men and tie them down to a mere mechanical observance of outward forms, but to build them up, as free men and women, in the fellowship of Christ, is their great object. They value, as the Church of England does, the historic continuity of the Christian Church—its accredited Episcopate, its ancient creeds and liturgies, its sacraments and worship—as means to an end, that end being to draw all men together in the faith of a common Redeemer, rejoicing in the love of God, and living in the practice of that self-sacrificing love of their neighbour which Christ taught.

Once more, there is this also in Old Catholicism as a religious system, to interest us all,—and having perhaps a special significance for the Church of England,—that it has adopted with great boldness the principle of giving a large share of power to the laity. The Old Catholic bishops (excluding Holland) are elected by the joint votes of the clergy and of the lay representatives. Even the parish clergy are elected by the congregations. And all legislation lies with the Synod, which is composed of clergy and laity, under the presidency of the bishop. It need hardly be said that this, among Continental Catholics, is a great innovation. But it cannot be denied that there is authority for it in the early ages of the Church. And so far the system has worked well—as it has done also in our own colonies.

—and without any real diminution of Episcopal authority. There is some importance in this for ourselves. Beyond doubt, there can be no really vigorous life in any Church, in the affairs of which the laity do not take an active share. And although the varying circumstances of different Churches must largely affect the extent and character of that share, the experience of the Old Catholics may have a special value for some of us at home.

One thing must be added. I have spoken this afternoon only of those Old Catholics who belong to duly-constituted Churches in Holland, (Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. But there are besides some considerable bodies who either have reformed or are engaged in reforming themselves on the same lines in other countries also. In Spain there are eight congregations, who have Señor Cabrera as their bishop-elect; there are five others in Portugal; the zealous labours of Count Henry di Campello have led to the formation of two in Italy; and M. Loyson (better known in this country as the Père Hyacinthe) is at the head of one in Paris. It must further be noted, that in addition to those who have had the courage to declare themselves Old Catholics, there are tens of thousands who secretly sympathize with them.

The truth is, that for generations past there has been a very widespread desire for substantial reforms among the Roman Catholics of Europe. The Vatican decrees brought on a crisis; and the importance of Old Catholicism lies in this, that it has provided the permanent means and opportunities, which were wanting before, for leavening large masses of the population in various countries, and thus paving the way for far greater results hereafter.

All who value the supremacy of conscience, all who care for religious liberty, all who feel a strict truthfulness to be the first element of Christian morals—still more, all who believe in the Divine mission of Christ's One Catholic and Apostolic Church, and who, because they do so, are jealous for its purity and eager to cleanse it from superstition and from worldliness, that it may be fit to deliver worthily its loving message to mankind—must assuredly wish the Old Catholics God speed.

We are passing through a period of transition; and if what we desire should be the outcome of it, is not mere change but betterment; above all, if our longing is that, in a degree we have not reached yet, the Law of Force should be replaced by the Law of Love, as in all things, so most of all in Religion—then we shall welcome whatever "makes for Righteousness," in religious teaching and religious life. And this, I am convinced, is true of Old Catholicism.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY REV. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, M.A.,

*Rector of St. Nicholas' Cole, Abbey, and Professor of Pastoral Theology in
King's College, London.*

THE Church of England, it is sometimes said, with a certain tone of contempt, is a compromise. The old and inaccurate epigram about her Arminian liturgy and Calvinistic articles is recalled. The fact is accentuated, that three well-defined schools of thought may be traced among both clergy and laity, shading away into a great variety of intermediate opinions. Accordingly, it is often declared, that only the golden links of Establishment prevent the Church of England from falling to pieces, and that, as Dr. Momerie has lately announced to admiring drawing-rooms, she is within measurable distance of dissolution.

There is at least so much of truth in the "compromise" theory, that the statesmen and ecclesiastics who guided the course of the English Reformation fell back, perhaps to some extent unconsciously, upon the idea of a national Church as an autonomous portion of the universal or catholic Church. The conception was that of a universal human society, founded by the Lord Jesus Christ, conditioned by national character and adapted to national needs; each national Church retaining large powers of self-government, and owing no allegiance to any personal, visible head, or to any supreme authority on earth, save and except that of the universal society itself, expressed and uttered through a General Council. The comparison may perhaps be ventured to a world-confederacy of states, each state possessing a large measure of independence, but owing allegiance to a federal constitution.

The task of the English Church was to vindicate the independence of national Churches, and to define its limits. The relations of a national Church to the universal society, on the one hand, and to the nation itself, on the other, were the practical problems to be solved. The former was dealt with by repudiating the claims of the Papacy to absolute dominion over the universal society, and by accepting the authority of these General Councils, which were admitted to express the sense of the undivided Church. Cranmer's famous appeal to a General Council was the voice of the English Church. The creeds, the two great sacraments, the canon of Scripture, the "historic episcopate," these were the property, so to speak, of the whole Church, and with them the Church of England could not

meddle. There were other matters with which, she judged, a national Church was thoroughly competent to deal. Her own forms of worship and methods of internal government, for example, while following the general type, might and should be arranged by herself. Her own officers should be appointed as she herself might approve, without external interference. It was attempted to solve the second problem by the help of a principle which really underlay the whole movement of the Reformation. The power which undermined the mediæval Papacy was the growth of the national consciousness. Men had come to perceive that the nation itself was a Divine organization. They realized the sanctity of the State. They felt that the nation's own language, the "vulgar tongue," was the most fitting vehicle for the utterance of the people's highest thoughts and deepest feelings. They regarded it as one of a nation's most sacred rights and supreme duties to provide for the worship and religious teaching of the people. Hence followed the theory of Hooker, restated in more recent days by Arnold, that Church and State are not two societies, but the nation itself under different aspects. Every Englishman, as such, was potentially an English Churchman.

It cannot be said that Hooker's theory has borne the test of three centuries. It has been broken against the logic of events. But it does not follow that, because this particular view cannot now be maintained, there is nothing which survives in that general idea of a national Church which found expression at the Reformation, but which can, in fact, be traced up to a far earlier period. If Church and State in England are two societies, and not one, history has yet bound them so intimately together, that to separate them will be a task of stupendous difficulty. The Church of England, then, represents not a compromise, but a principle, apart from Hooker's so called "Erastian" theory. Has this principle endured the test which has shattered the theory? In other words, is there room, in the England of to-day, for a national Church? And if so, how far does the Establishment fulfil the necessary conditions?

It may conduce to clearness to state at this point that the present writer regards the universal Church as consisting, *in idea*, of the whole of humanity; *in fact*, of a society of persons called out to witness to man's true condition in God. Just so, the Church of England consists, *in idea*, of the whole English people: *in fact*, of baptized Englishmen and Englishwomen. The external rite of baptism is (among other things) the method of admission to the Church; and it is to be observed that it is given to infants, who can have neither correct opinions nor pious feelings of any kind. To be a man is, implicitly, to be a Churchman; and the promises of the baptismal service—to give up the evil, to believe the true, to follow the right—amount to an undertaking to be a true man. On this undertaking the Church gives baptism to every child; and formerly gave confirmation and communion (as still in the Eastern Churches) at the same time and on the same terms. This indicates a marked difference between

the Church's bond of membership and that of some other religious bodies. The holding of common opinions, the experience of common emotion, are not the fundamental facts of union in the Church. She does not profess to be a religious aristocracy, consisting of all the wise or all the good. She is catholic, belonging to all mankind; and her sacrament of admission to membership is bestowed upon any unconscious child who may be brought to her founts, simply because it is a human being.

The principle of a national Church is widely regarded as utterly out of harmony with the tone and tendency of our age, and Disestablishment is now well within the horizon of practical politics. It may however be questioned whether the assumption upon which the proposed de-nationalization of the Church rests, is not itself out of harmony with modern thought and feeling. That principle I take to be, that the State, as such, has nothing to do with religion. It may not be set forward quite so fiercely as by those earlier Liberationists who contended that the State was "the world," with which the Church could rightly have no relations. But it seems to be the natural and inevitable conclusion from the premises of the old Liberal party in England, who were associated with the Manchester School. They held as their fundamental doctrine, that the State should interfere as little as possible. A free State, as they conceived it, was one in which the government imposed the fewest duties on the citizens, and left things generally alone to work themselves out. A free Church, in their view, was one altogether self-governed. It naturally followed, that the very idea of Establishment was repugnant to them; and Disestablishment, as a plank in the political platform, is a survival of the old within the new Liberalism. Yet the new Liberalism is far from holding the essential "worldliness" of the State; still farther from accepting the non-interference doctrines of the Manchester School. On the contrary, the English democracy of to-day calls in the State at every turn. We are practically agreed, *pace* Mr. Herbert Spencer and Mr. Auberon Herbert, that the State ought to provide means for the well-being and elevation of all her children. Free libraries, free education, public recreation grounds, provision for public health,—all these are now recognised as the care of the State. Then why not free religion?—not in the sense of the Manchester School, but in the modern sense which gives a wider scope to the word freedom. Only a certain section of atheists will contend that religion is the highest and most necessary of all means to the well-being of a people. Alexander Vinet, the great Swiss Liberationist, consistently opposed the principle of Establishment on the ground that it was a fundamentally socialistic principle. "The individualism which Vinet preached," says the Rev. T. Hancock, "as the road to social salvation, and upon which every sectarian 'Church' is founded, is rejected and hated by the newer *Zeitgeist* as the road to social damnation." Mr. Hancock also points out that the two "most democratic States in the world," Zürich and Geneva have each recently affirmed, by the vote of

the entire people, that the principle of Establishment is a grand essentially democratic principle.

It would seem, then, that the idea of a national Church has still some vitality. It is not so dead as yesterday its enemies imagined. That which is really dead is the principle of State non-interference, upon which the policy of Disestablishment was founded. And it will be difficult to show, in the face of democratic Switzerland and republican France, that the most progressive countries of modern Europe are opposed to the principle of Establishment. It will be even more difficult to prove that the conditions in England are so different from those of France and Switzerland, that we must adopt a course which they decisively reject.

It appears, then, that we cannot rightly assume, without much deeper investigation, that the theory of a national Church is out of harmony with the democratic feeling of to-day.

An institution which has grown up with the nation, intertwined with and embedded in her whole history, as is the case of the Church of England, has undoubtedly great advantages over similar bodies. When it is asserted that the Established Church is a "privileged" body, it is really this which is meant. Her close association with the State has not been effected by any act of the sovereign or of the legislature. As is frequently pointed out, no Act of Parliament exists creating an establishment of religion in England. It grew, it was not made; although, inevitably, its growth has needed and has received recognition and adjustment from time to time, at the hands of the law and the Parliament of England.

Upon the face of things, this "historical continuity" is a possession beyond all price. Few will now be found to repeat the old fallacy about a "new Church" made by Henry VIII., except from a standpoint which is not that of the best modern historians. The inheritance of a great past is a fact of unalterable power. It appeals to all men in whom the imaginative and poetic faculties are developed. It confers a majesty which nothing else can give. It invests even an unworthy "descendant of a hundred earls" with a certain dignity and pathos, born of the contrast between the men of the older time, whose great deeds made splendid their name, and the degradation of him who has defiled it. Nonconformists are swift to claim their share in the history of the Church; and they claim no more than their right. But, as a leading Nonconformist layman lately remarked to the present writer, it is not quite the same thing after all. He added, that while he did not envy the Church her episcopal form of government, or her slow-moving and somewhat rigid legal constitution, he "admired and desired" beyond all words her historical basis in the roots of the realm of England.

* But inestimable as this advantage is, and great as is the reserve of latent strength to which it points, there can be no sort of doubt that not a few minor defects and disadvantages are involved in it. There is almost of necessity a difficulty in adapting the methods of an ancient organization so

as to meet needs wholly new. If there is merit in not moving too fast, there is great inconvenience and some loss in being hampered at every turn by precedents and customs and red tape. There is, it may be, a certain forfeiture of spontaneity and swiftness; a tendency to conventionality and compromise, a peril of getting out of touch with the life and movement of the world of men. That the Church of England suffers to some extent from these *défauts de notre qualité* cannot be denied. Take the case of a beneficed clergyman, who unhappily is a disgrace to his office. Such examples are few, in spite of the keen scent of certain journals for "clerical scandals," and their vigorous beating of the drum anti-ecclesiastic. In a body of twenty-four thousand there must needs be a certain number of bad men and of foolish men; and the fierce light which beats upon their misdoings from the red lamp of personal journalism has given a mistaken impression of the proportion such persons bear to the whole body of the clergy. But, however few they may be, it is surely obvious that a drunken, immoral, or thoroughly idle clergyman ought not to remain pastor of a parish for life. Yet the difficulty of getting rid of him almost amounts to impossibility. The bishop can scarcely oust him, even when the case is clear, without the harass of infinite trouble, and an expenditure which is said to run into thousands of pounds. Repeated attempts have been made to abate this scandal, but without conspicuous success. It may be hoped that the latest effort may be more satisfactory in its results.

The independent position of the beneficed clergy illustrates very fairly the advantages and disadvantages of the peculiar position of the Church of England. It is an undoubted advantage to a man who earnestly desires to serve his Master, and help his fellow men, to find himself secure of house and income, able to snap his fingers at the man with the long purse, to speak the truth and do the right without fear. He ministers in a building round which the whole parish grew up, hallowed by the sacred memories of centuries, the centre of the corporate life of the place. He has baptized and married most of his young people; he blessed their fathers' graves in the churchyard beneath the gray tower; he has known them all in every relation of life. The parish clergyman can be, by virtue of his position, and he very often is, the link between class and class, the builder of bridges—*pontifex maximus*, as a witty bishop said—over gulfs fixed between man and man.

On the other hand, his settled position has its temptations and perils for himself, and its disadvantages for his parishioners. Too often he becomes fossilized; in the country, he tends to develop, as Sydney Smith puts it, into a "holy vegetable." His position brings him into contact with the rich and the well-to-do; and he may perhaps come to look at life, almost unconsciously, from their standpoint, and content himself with merely trying to "do good" to the poor, instead of teaching them how to do it for themselves. His methods lack variety, and he himself often

lacks intellectual companionship. His position gives him considerable power, and he has been known to use it in an unwise or dictatorial fashion. But whatever he may be, his benefice is his freehold; and he cannot be ejected from it except by a cumbrous, costly, tedious and uncertain process. And what is true in this respect is true also in others. "Legal difficulties" bar the way of movements and adaptations admitted to be desirable; and these are part of our inheritance. Not so long ago, it was necessary to get a special Act of Parliament in order to build a new church. It is still necessary to get it in order to alter a rubric. Clearly the Church of England suffers certain disadvantages from the fact of her position, and they are neither few nor light. But they are a part of the price paid for the inestimable possession of a great historical position; and it may possibly be that the wiser course is to trust that friction against facts will gradually wear them away.

The organization of the Church of England closely connects itself with the national idea. Mr. J. R. Green has pointed out the important bearing of the work of Archbishop Theodore, to whom the work of organization was, in the first instance, due, upon the consolidation of the realm of England. The principle of local government finds expression in the parish, the "local organ" both of Church and nation. The parishes are grouped in dioceses, each under its own bishop, the limit of whose jurisdiction seems at first to have roughly corresponded to the tribal partitions of the country, a division which has in some cases lasted almost to our own time. The dioceses, again, are organized under one of the two metropolitans of England, and belong either to the province of Canterbury or to the province of York. This plan of local organization at once marks a difference between the Church of England clergyman and ministers of other denominations. He is the pastor of a parish; they of their own congregations. *He* ministers to a congregation which God has already called into the fellowship of neighbourhood and common life; *they* minister to congregations called together by mutual agreement in religious opinion, or by common spiritual feeling and experience; or, it may be, by the attractiveness of the pastor's teaching or methods. Every parishioner has the right to the ministrations of the parish clergyman, as he has the right to a place in the parish church. The rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer do not speak of members of a congregation in our modern sense, but in the sense of parishioners. The parish is the local "congregation of the Lord." The persistence of this older idea is seen in the fact that a considerable number of persons, who do not usually attend the ministrations of the Church of England, prefer to seek them at the more important turning-points of life, as for marriages, burials, and baptisms. The parish vestry is a survival of perhaps the oldest form of public assembly, and it is still not infrequently held in the parish church (as were the City Wardmotes until very recent times) in order to discuss and determine local matters, civil and ecclesiastical.

This ancient constitution of the English Church, with its deep roots in the national and local life, is a source of some weakness and friction in so far as the facts have ceased to correspond with the idea. The endeavour to adapt an old organization to new needs must always involve some anomalies, and give rise to practical difficulties. It may be questioned whether even a successful attempt to tear out roots by means of Disestablishment would altogether set us free from them. But it can scarcely be doubted that the possession of so efficient and ancient an organization is a source of far greater strength than weakness to the Church. She will not lightly let it go, even if disestablishment should make its retention, in remote country districts and elsewhere, a matter of supreme difficulty. It may then be necessary to revert for a time, to the pre-reformation plan of working from a centre, in the shape of a large community-house. But the parochial system, with all its practical defects, is far too great a heritage to be easily parted with; and no effort will be considered too exacting which may give hope of maintaining it.

It is, however, certain that the present position and prospects of the Church of England will be judged from the practical point of view characteristic of the English people. Unlike our French neighbours, we think less of logical consistency than of practical efficiency, and we are willing to tolerate a certain lack of symmetry about our Constitution, and to put up with anomalies in the various relations of our national life, if only the machine "works well." Whether, therefore, the immediate question regards the English Church as an establishment, in view of its possible ceasing to be such; or whether it simply concerns her general work as one religious body among others, it may be taken for granted that the answer will be determined chiefly upon the practical work she has done or is doing.

It must be observed that this is at best a rough and superficial test. The true work of a Church is to purify and preserve the moral tone of society, as "leaven," or as "salt," mingling with "the whole lump," which it affects; and to train and uplift the inmost character of individuals. Obviously no human test can be adequately applied to influences so subtle, so impossible of analysis. They are out of the reach of figures and averages; they evade all attempts to state or estimate results in the ordinary way. Still, without forgetting that we cannot penetrate into this region, where alone the final results are to be found, we may reach certain conclusions, not without considerable value in their own place, from a brief survey of the external work and working of the Church of England.

Although she is sometimes described as "the wealthiest Church in Christendom"—a title which needs some qualification—the amount of money raised during the last fifty years for Church building and restoration, and for annual maintenance of church work, is, even from that point of view, enormous. The uninviting pages of the "Church Year-Book" contain figures which will startle even those who are prepared for much. Lord Hampton's well-known return, incomplete though it was, showed

that between the years 1840 and 1874 no less a sum than £25,548,793 was raised for building and restoring cathedrals and churches.¹ Six millions, at the least, were raised during the five years 1883 to 1887, for the same purpose. The sums collected and expended upon extending and developing the work of the Church in the large towns are upon the same gigantic scale ; and it must be remembered that these statements take no account of moneys spent upon Schools, contributed to Foreign Missions, to various Church Societies, Theological Colleges, and the like ; or, except to a limited extent, of annual maintenance.

The remarkable development of lay work is a sign both of a pressing need and of the richness of the sources of supply. The Lay Helpers' Association of the diocese of London numbers nearly seven thousand men ; while the multiplication of guilds, and the frequent association of a poor London parish with a West-End congregation, point to the fact that this total does not represent anything like the real number of those who are organized for all kinds of work under the clergy. The ministry of women has not indeed been developed along the lines of the Salvation Army. But the Anglican Sisterhoods and nursing institutions are among the most noteworthy growths of our time ; and even these are exceeded in numbers, though not in self-devotion and spiritual power, by the vast and vigorous organization of the Girls' Friendly Society. It is sufficient merely to mention the various Church Temperance and Purity Societies, almost all of them born but yesterday ; and to point to the yet more recent upgrowth of societies for the study and practical application of the bearing of the doctrines of the Church upon politics and social problems.

The clergy may be thought in some quarters to have deteriorated in quality, because they are now partly recruited from a lower social grade, and because comparatively few of them take honours and Fellowships at the Universities, or become eminent in science, literature, and art. The former reason is a curious one, coming as it generally does from pronounced democrats, and may be dismissed as of small importance outside the drawing-rooms. For the latter there is assuredly much ground. To the present writer, part of whose duty it is to train candidates for the ministry, it seems as incontrovertible as it is unfortunate that the average Anglican clergy are, intellectually, less powerful than they were wont to be. But it is not altogether their fault. The arrears of parochial work, the burdens of detail and organization, which have fallen upon them in our time are so appalling that they may well be pardoned if they have thought more of doing what they could to overtake them than of editing

¹ The writer was present, a few years since, at a public Conference between Churchmen and Nonconformists held in the City Temple. One of the Church speakers quoted figures from this return, referring to the amount spent upon the fabric of the cathedrals. The audience, consisting mainly of Nonconformists, greeted the statement with loud cries of "Shame !" Did they mean that the Church ought not to have maintained these noble buildings upon a scale proportionate to their design and purpose ? At the least, the incident made it clear that such an audience could scarcely worship with comfort in an average Anglican cathedral.

Greek texts. The modern clerical ideal is different from that of the last generation; and the town vicar of to-day is apt to spend his time in flying all over his parish, while he neglects his books and his sermon-building, just as the parson of learned leisure often neglected his parish for his study in the days of yore. Great scholars are rare; yet not a few are to be found among the clergy, while the average English cleric will bear fair comparison with the minister of any other religious body, or with the average layman. It can scarcely admit of question, nevertheless, that a much-needed reform is an extension of the period devoted to the general culture and training of candidates for orders, more particularly of those who go only to a theological college. The Universities do not now profess to give technical theological training such as is furnished by Cuddesden, or the theological department of King's College, London. Nor can the theological colleges, unless their scope is widened and their funds are greatly augmented, supply even elementary general culture. Consequently, if a candidate for orders goes to the University, he must superadd his necessary theology; and if to a theological college, he must get his general culture elsewhere.

What has been said merely indicates that renewal of spiritual energy and of activity in good works which is acknowledged upon all hands. The Church of England has not only become interesting, as Matthew Arnold said, during the present reign; she has become a living and growing power upon the common life. In the towns, it is universally admitted, the Church of England has gained enormously; so much so that in all probability Disestablishment would make but small difference (except possibly in very poor districts) to outward seeming. In the country, however, where the Church was thought strongest not so long since, she would appear not to have gained much ground, perhaps even to have lost. Too great stress need not be laid upon "burial scandals," and the like. But there can be no doubt that there is a strong anti-clerical and anti-Establishment feeling among English working people, and that this now seems most active in the rural districts. The tone of the newspapers most widely read among the working classes is quite sufficient to establish this. The causes of it will probably be traced mainly to the somewhat pronounced political partisanship of many among the country clergy, and to the fact that the ordinary workman has no voice or influence in the choice of his parish priest; not to any wide-spread disbelief, or dislike of the Church as a religious organization. It is assuredly the case that the recently developed activity of a section of the clergy in the direction of social questions has had a marked influence upon the feeling and attitude of the working classes. It must not be thought, however, that it has detached them from the advocacy of Disestablishment to any great extent, although the middle and lower classes do appear to have undergone some change of opinion, largely owing to the successful labours of the High Church school.

If the Church of England would escape the dislocation and shock of Disestablishment, we must show greater energy in reforming abuses than at present is the case. We heard loud talk of Church reform about the time of the 1885 election, when Disestablishment was in the air, and largely signed petitions were presented to the Convocations. Nothing, or very little, seems to have come of it all. Churchmen are not agreed as to what is required, and the House of Commons dislikes ecclesiastical legislation exceedingly. Yet without reform, Disestablishment is certain; even with it, Establishment is not secure.

Reform is simply freedom for the Church to work out her own inherent ideas on her own historic lines. The happy phrase "Home Rule for the Church" exactly expresses what in the first instance is needed. For this she must go to Parliament. She would never have to go again; although ecclesiastical legislation would probably lie on the table of the House of Commons for a defined period, and then, if no objection were taken, would become Church law.

The Church may surely claim that the fetters forged by Thomas Cromwell, wherewith to bind her to the footstool of Henry VIII.'s throne, should now in justice be loosed. Till then, the Church had been the one power in England which consistently maintained the people's right, and stood between the poor and their tyrants; which made for education, for justice, for progress. Since then, the bishops and clergy—not the Church—have too often been on the side of privilege and oppression. Yet the basis and constitution of the Church Catholic are essentially Democratic; and in order to enable the Church of England to get in touch with the English people and their new needs, it is only necessary that she should be free to work out her own principles.

1. The right of lay Church-folk to a direct share in the government and administration of Church affairs should be recognised and given definite expression. Diocesan conferences and the House of Laymen are merely consultative bodies, useful in their way, but powerless. Parochial councils, although recommended by Convocation so long ago as 1870, have only been established in a few instances. The principle of Home Rule would be most usefully applied to the existing organization, if a representative Church council were called into being in every parish, with well-defined statutory powers; and a corresponding organization for every diocese, leading up to a reformed Convocation as a central governing body. In all these bodies, of course, the laity would have their part. They are the Church, the clergy are but its officers. According to all experience in other fields, nothing would so effectively show the people that the National Church is their own as such a recognition of their rights and responsibilities. It need not here be asked what should be the test of membership in the Church, though this important problem lies at the threshold.

2. The scandals of traffic in livings and the abuses of patronage must be ended. To mend them is hopeless. A Select Committee of the House

of Commons reported in 1884 in favour of abolishing all sales, except to public bodies, with certain limitations; and recommended that public notice should in all cases be given to the parishioners before the institution of a clergyman presented to a living, in order that if they had any objection to make they might be heard. This is the very least that can be done. For myself, I desire that the clergyman should be elected by the parish, and the bishop by the diocese, as in the early days of the Christian Church; believing that this is really a principle of the Church's constitution, and that the alleged scandals of popular election are infinitely less than those of patronage and sale. For the present, however, a right of veto only might be claimed by the parish; and, as a safeguard, some voice should be given to the Bishop in Council. Non-parochial places should also be provided, perhaps at the cathedrals, for scholars engaged in theological research.

3. The whole question of Church endowments should be thoroughly examined—say, by a Royal Commission; and upon the basis of facts thus provided let power be given to redistribute funds, just as the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are doing to some extent at present. It would not be desirable, in my judgment, to equalize clerical incomes; and there is greater security for freedom of mind, and more protection against fear of the man with the long purse, if clerical stipends are not paid directly, or entirely, by the congregation. The position and payment of assistant curates also demand readjustment.

4. The revision of the Church's formularies must be left to theological and liturgical experts, if undertaken at all. But there remain the questions of clerical subscription and of the Act of Uniformity. As regards subscription, the Thirty-nine Articles are admitted no longer to serve the purpose for which they were imposed on the clergy. It is scarcely too much to say that they are chiefly retained from a wholesome fear of the disturbances and controversies which would be raised by a proposal to abolish subscription altogether, or to substitute acceptance of the ancient creeds. But the question must be faced, and an answer found. The Act of Uniformity was originally a measure of relief, intended to secure to the people certain rights which the Puritans denied them. The time has clearly come for its relaxation—at least to such an extent as to allow of greater variety and elasticity in the services, and perhaps to admit qualified laymen to preach under the bishop's licence.

My private belief is that if private patronage were abolished, and the clergy elected by the people, as in Switzerland, all other details of reform would soon follow, and nothing more would be heard of Disestablishment. So great a change would have to be accomplished gradually, and the practical difficulties are almost as great as those of disendowment. I have small hope of seeing it fulfilled in my lifetime. But I am convinced that an advance in this direction is the only alternative to Disestablishment

The risks of the latter policy have never been fully faced by either side. That the Church would become stronger, richer, more numerous, more powerful, after a few years of confusion and resettlement, I am sure ; so sure, that were I a mere ecclesiastical tactician, bent on getting the best terms for my own religious body, I would vote for Disestablishment to-morrow. The doubtful "privileges" of the clergy would be cheaply got rid of along with the vexatious disabilities which hamper us ; as, for example, the rule which prevents us from sitting in the House of Commons.

But over and above the immediate crippling of energy, and loss of means, and difficulty of keeping up Church Organization in poor districts, I shrink from such a breach with the past as the disappearance of the Established Church would involve. And I fear that a body, such as the Disestablished Church would become, might only too easily develop into a formidable danger to the State—a political *parti prêtre*.

But whatever may be the future of the Church of England as an Establishment, she has to-day the promise and potency of full and vigorous life. Disendowment may in some degree cripple her for a time, but it cannot touch the inner sources of her call, her devotion, and her strength. They who believe in her commission, and know her history, are they who have the firmest faith in her future.

NONCONFORMITY.

By J. ALLANSON PICTON, M.A., M.P.

THE title of this paper was not of my choosing; and when I came to think of it, it appeared to me to present some preliminary difficulties to which perhaps I had better allude. Nonconformity, properly so called, exists only on a very narrow portion of the earth's surface. It is confined almost entirely to England and Wales. To a certain extent it may be said to exist in Scotland, but on Scottish Nonconformity I shall have another word to say presently. It is entirely unknown in Ireland, it is also unknown in the United States of America, and likewise in the British Colonies. It is unknown in Ireland, in the United States, and in the Colonies, for the simple reason that there exists in those happy lands no established and authoritative Church, from which it is a crime, or at least a social misdemeanour, to dissent. Where there is no legal standard of Conformity, obviously there can be no such thing as Nonconformity; and I could not but admire the sound common-sense of Lord Salisbury a few months ago, who, when he was presented with an address from certain alleged Irish Nonconformists, immediately remarked that no such people could possibly exist in Ireland, since the Church was disestablished.

Not only is it the case that Nonconformity, properly so called, exists over a very limited extent of the earth's surface, but the word has an entirely different meaning on opposite sides of the Scottish Border. I heard an amusing illustration of this one day when I was standing upon the Calton Hill in Edinburgh, and surveying the noble prospect afforded there of the modern Athens. I was told that a good Presbyterian citizen had recently been showing the lions of his native city to an Anglican clergyman on a visit there. They ascended the Calton Hill together, and the Presbyterian citizen pointed out with pride the large number of ecclesiastical buildings to be seen. Said the Anglican clergyman, "Certainly it is a glorious sight." "Well, yes," replied the Presbyterian citizen, "but it is a little marred by the steeples of those interloping Nonconformists." "What!" asked the clergyman in surprise; "surely there are very few Methodists or Independents in this country." "Oh, no," said the Presbyterian citizen, "it is the Episcopalian Dissenting Churches that I allude to." The good Anglican clergyman had not thought at all of the fact that what was Nonconformity in England was Conformity in Scotland, and what was established in England would be Dissent in Scotland. The word has, as I have said, entirely different meanings on opposite sides of the Border. This is obviously a difficulty in the way of any compre-

hensive treatment of the subject of Nonconformity. For all the forms of Christianity are Nonconformist somewhere or other, and it can scarcely have been the wish of the committee who manage this series of lectures that I should attempt to deal with the opposition between all historical Church establishments on the one hand, and all Dissenting sects in every part of the world on the other. Nevertheless this idea of opposition gives the key, in my view, to the meaning of the managers of these lectures, in asking me to undertake the subject of Nonconformity. They wish me, I presume, to deal with those English forms of Christianity the evolution of which has been marked by the clash of conflict against the traditional Catholic hierarchy, and, consequentially, against the secular despotisms that have raged in this country in times gone by.

Now, the various denominations whose history has this mark of conflict in common present endless varieties of belief and of ecclesiastical organization; but all these varieties sprang originally from one central conviction, on which I desire to dwell. That central conviction was this, that a living inspiration is always to be preferred to a dead tradition. Observe I use the word inspiration in no magic or miraculous sense. As nearly as I can put it into the form of a definition, what I mean thereby is an impulse that comes to emotional souls from a glimpse through the veil of illusion into the deeper realities behind it. And such glimpses into the deeper realities of life, when they are experienced, seem like—and I verily believe are—the inflow of a universal life upon the sensitive heart. From Isaiah to Shakespeare and onwards to Burns or Browning, where, apart from the poetic beauty of expression in their utterances, you are moved to deep and noble emotions, it is only by words that take you behind the veil of conventional ideas, and surround you with the verities of moral truth.

I do not know that ever a landscape looks more charming than when it is suddenly revealed to you through a rent in a cloud. I remember in the often misty, but always grand and beautiful, land of Norway, I was wandering once down a mountain-side towards the seaward end of a valley, and I found myself entirely encompassed by an impenetrable mist. But after some few minutes of patience, suddenly a rift was cleared, and down below I saw the solid luminous rocky feet of the adjoining mountains, and amidst them an exquisite little village, with deep red roofs relieved against a background of verdant meadow. Never did the solid luminous earth appear so real or so beautiful to me, as by contrast with the bewildering, uncertain mist in which I had been lost. So it is with the soul that gets a glimpse of solid, luminous reality through the uncertain mists of conventionalism and dead tradition.

Those who have been sometimes wearied out with the dull monotony of many Nonconformist services, or perhaps disgusted with the mercenary vulgarity of others, may wonder that I should attribute to Nonconformity any share of such inspiration as I have spoken of. How can there be in

Nonconformity, as we know it in most conventicles at the present day, any impulse coming to emotional souls from a glimpse through the veil of illusion into the deeper realities behind? But remember, I said just now that all varieties of belief and organization, embraced within this wide word Nonconformity, sprang *originally* from such inspiration; I did not say that they always represent such inspiration now. They sprang originally from such inspiration, and were for the most part glorious in the beginning. The stream that stagnates as dead ditchwater, in the spreading mouth at the outlet of a tidal river, may have leapt into the light as liquid crystal, where the mountain-top meets the heavens; and so it may happen, and very often does happen, that organizations which appear now as very dull and prosaic sects had most noble origins. It would, however, be invidious to particularize by way of illustration, and therefore I leave you to apply the remark for yourselves.

Now, it is in its origin that Nonconformity is most instructive to us. In its after-progress I am fain to confess that it has often been far more useful for purposes of warning, except in some respects, which I shall advert to presently. The conflict between Nonconformity and the established hierarchy is only a modern form of the perennial opposition between priestcraft on the one hand and prophetism on the other. The priest, from the very beginning of religious organization, and even perhaps in prehistoric times, represented customs that had become sacred from their inveteracy. He represented traditional mysteries which necessarily clothed these in ritual. He represented spiritual authority that arrayed itself in pomp and glory. The prophet, on the other hand, represented inspiration in the sense that I have given to the word. He represented the emergence of truth out of mystery; the substitution of life for ritual and of moral force for the mechanical weight of authority. You may find this contrast vividly portrayed in the Old Testament. A quaint and striking instance occurs to my mind in the Book of Amos the prophet. There we read that Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, the most sacred place at that time in the northern kingdom of Israel, was seriously scandalized by the plain, straightforward words of invective uttered by the mouth of Amos against the wickedness of the priesthood and the people of the court. Being unable to bear his words longer, and apparently somewhat afraid of him, Amaziah said: "O, thou seer, get thee into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and there prophesy: but prophesy not in Bethel; for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court." The reply of Amos was more forcible than courteous, and by no means so touching as the words uttered by a still greater prophet, Jeremiah, in somewhat similar circumstances. He resolved, owing to the strenuousness of the opposition against him, to speak no more in the name of the Lord; but, says he: "His word was then within me as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." In such illustrations as these you have, set forth with dramatic force, the contrast between the

priestly order of things sustained by convention, custom, and passion; and, on the other hand, the vital inspiration of the prophet, who sees through the mists of error a new truth—or rather, an eternal truth freshly revealed—and must speak or die.

Christianity itself was in its origin an extraordinary development of this opposition between prophetism and priestcraft. You know it is said of Jesus that when he addressed the multitudes “they were astonished at His doctrine, because He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.” Now, foolish commentators have sometimes, though not in recent times, seen in these words an acknowledgment of some Divine and supernatural claim on the part of Christ to instant obedience, not on account of the truth He spoke, but because of His personal prerogatives. Such, however, is as far as possible from being the meaning of the words. The contrast is drawn between His teaching and that of the scribes, who were the satellites of the priests. The scribes gave form and order to the traditions that had come down amongst the priests and their followers. The scribes put into ancient and dried formulas the old customs that had become sacred through inveteracy; and their only idea of proving any opinion was to count up the number of authorities by whom it had been held. But this new prophet, Jesus, appealed to no external authority whatever. He spoke words that were luminous with the truth they bore to the soul within. As He told the people of meekness, of mercy, of forgiveness, of brotherhood, of simplicity, of humility, the words bore their own evidence with them to the conscience of the hearer, and needed no appeal to any other authority. This is the real force of the description of His preaching, as that of one who spoke as having authority and not as the scribes. His words came as a revelation bearing its own evidence with it.

And yet Christianity, be it observed, was not in its origin a Nonconformist denomination; that is to say, it did not depart or separate itself from the established religion of the day. It kept the law of Moses; and the very first followers of Jesus, like Himself, worshipped in the Temple and in the synagogues. It was St. Paul who first developed Christianity into an outwardly Nonconformist religion. It was St. Paul who first taught that the ritual and law of Moses was worthless, and had no power of salvation in it. It was St. Paul who first invited heathen of all classes and of all races to enter the Church without undergoing any superstitious rite, and without binding themselves to observe any ancient law whatever. What would Christianity have been had it lived up to St. Paul? St. Paul is sometimes honoured by exaggeration on the one hand, and not sufficiently honoured on the other for the real virtues he possessed. St. Paul was not the profound philosopher, not the man of gigantic intellect, that he is sometimes represented to be. But neither was he the Calvinistic theologian that he is sometimes described as being. St. Paul was certainly a prophet in the sense I have given to the word. The mist of

Jewish convention and tradition disappeared from before his eyes, and he saw the solid luminous realities of moral truth and goodness that are in themselves eternal, and independent of any positive law whatever; and he taught those higher and broader truths of morality as sufficient in themselves for salvation. All that has been ascribed to him as Calvinistic theology is only so much illustration, so much rabbinical habit, which the man could not shake off, or to which he may have clung, either on his own account or on account of the interests of the people whom he addressed. He does indulge largely in rabbinical modes of argument, and in Jewish illustrations; but those who carefully read his writings will always see that there is an object beyond these illustrations, and that the ultimate end is always the establishment of a moral truth, independent of mere convention and tradition. It is too often forgotten that St. Paul throughout his writings, so far as we possess them, never suggested such a thing as excommunication for differences of religious belief. He does occasionally tell his disciples to separate themselves from a brother who is walking in scandalous impurity; but those who read and remember will know that, in one of his epistles, he refers to brethren in the Corinthian Church, who actually said there was no resurrection. What does he do? He argues with them. He tells them of what he believes to have been his own experience; he charges them with inconsistency and with folly; but he gives no direction that they shall be excommunicated from the Church.

How very different was his practice from that which would be inevitable in any so-called Evangelical Church at the present day! Paul wished to establish a higher life amongst the people. For this purpose he separated himself from the old Jewish ecclesiastical organizations, and endeavoured to establish in the world a Christianity which should be entirely free from its traditions. But, unfortunately, no man in that age of the world could possibly accomplish such a superhuman task. Notwithstanding all St. Paul's teaching, the customs of Christianity ever tended to harden into ritual. Its traditional mysteries became associated, through its chief sacrament, with an irrational dogma. Its ritual demanded a priesthood. Its priesthood developed into a hierarchy; its hierarchy necessarily assumed the functions of a spiritual tyranny.

During all this process of degeneration, however, protests and reactions continually arose. For the life of any religion, like the life of an organism, is shown by its power of internal rearrangement and reconstruction to meet the necessities of changing circumstances. But the reaction most affecting the subject with which we are now dealing did not occur, so far as our information goes, until some six centuries had passed over the Church. In the fifty-fourth chapter of his immortal history, Gibbon gives us a most interesting account of the heresy called that of the Paulicians, a name undoubtedly taken from the Apostle Paul. According to Gibbon's account—and the best informed ecclesiastics allow that, whatever his

beliefs may have been, his information is extremely accurate—a certain Syrian deacon in the course of his travels met with a Christian named Constantine, somewhere in the north of Syria, and in return for the hospitality he obtained in his house presented him with certain sacred documents, which turned out to consist of most of the canonical books of the New Testament. Constantine studied these with great eagerness, and was especially attracted, as any one coming upon them for the first time would necessarily be, by the passion and vitality and energy of St. Paul's writings. Constantine felt as if a mist were opening, and through a rift he saw more luminous and solid truth behind.

Undoubtedly he and his followers soon fell into many fantasies and errors, but, at the same time, their views were characterized by very much vigour and simplicity. He shook off the yoke of priestly superstition. He denied the necessity of either bishops or elders to dispense the Word of God aright. He repudiated the absolute need even for the sacraments of the Church. He insisted upon a pure life, and simple attachment to the teachings of Jesus, as they had come down through St. Paul. He rejected the yoke of the Old Testament, and thought that the New Testament had in it quite sufficient for salvation.

His followers multiplied rapidly, and spread over a considerable part of Asia Minor. As was always the case, until very recent times, spiritual independence necessarily led not only to conflicts with ecclesiastical, but to resistance against the secular, powers. They made a violent fight for themselves, did these Paulicians; but in the course of a century they were suppressed, and removed entirely from their native soil, and transplanted to the land of Thrace. Here they came into contact with the Bulgarians, who had been newly established in the district, and created another sect of heretics which was viewed with the utmost abhorrence in the Middle Ages. Yet, though we must allow that probably they had a great many wild ideas mingled with their simple fervour, on the whole there seems to be good reason to believe that they retained, even in Bulgaria, very much of the simplicity and devotion that had characterized the earliest Paulicians.

From Bulgaria this so-called heresy spread in various lines, traced by Gibbon to the west of Europe, and he believed, probably on fairly good grounds, that the teaching of the Vaudois and the Albigenses was to be traced, if we only had sufficient information on the subject, to the sporadic preaching of these Bulgarian heretics, who derived their spiritual origin from the Paulicians.

It is impossible to trace their influence directly on our own country. But there is very much similarity between the general spirit of Wycliffe and the Lollards on the one hand, and the religious ideas of the Paulicians on the other; and one can scarcely help suspecting that through some underground channels, the influence of the original sectaries had been brought to our own country. Be that as it may, the followers of Wycliffe

—the Lollards as they were called—kept alive a similar spirit, a similar desire to return to apostolic authority, for many years before the Reformation dawned upon this country; and it is doubtless owing to their perseverance and bravery and patience, that materials were preserved in this country on which a really spiritual and moral reform could work.

The Reformation that took a visible form in the sixteenth century in this country was something very different from that inculcated by Wycliffe and the Lollards. The royalties who wrought that Reformation were practically untouched by any religious revolt against superstition. Their objects were entirely political. It was inconvenient to them to depend for any purpose whatever upon the foreign authority of the Pope. All they wished was to shake his yoke from their necks, while they, at the same time, preserved the whole of the priestly discipline, which was so convenient in dealing with the people. The result was that there were two movements in this country, by no means vitally united, or even connected one with the other. There was the hierarchic movement, which was merely the assertion of episcopal independence of Rome, while the Catholic tradition was insisted on in its Anglican form; and on the other hand, there was the Wycliffite or Lollard or Nonconformist inspiration, which demanded a return to the teaching and spirit of St Paul.

It is obvious that I cannot take you through the history of the conflicts arising from the double character of our reformation. I need only remind you that the priestly, hierarchic Church of the Tudors and Stuarts entirely failed to satisfy the revived prophetic spirit of the more radical reformers. This dissatisfaction had much to do with preparing the way for the Great Rebellion, and, still more, it had to do with ensuring the triumph of that rebellion.

But, alas! few of the victors in the struggle understood what spirit they were of. Their notion was, that if they were perfectly and confidently sure of anything themselves, they must compel other people to be equally sure of it; and never were they satisfied unless they could succeed. Absolute freedom of belief, complete toleration for all forms of ecclesiastical organization, seems to us so much a matter of course, that we can scarcely conceive how two hundred and fifty years ago it was absolutely impossible. Even when the presbytery had overthrown the hierarchy, and wrung from a defeated king and aristocracy the freedom that had been so earnestly desired, Presbytery turned out to be, as John Milton humorously said, "old priest writ large"; and the intolerance of the presbytery was a thorn in the side of the very few earnest and thorough-going men who felt that there was no remedy for the contentions of the time, but complete and entire toleration of all differences of opinion. Even under the Commonwealth—although from some study on the subject I, in my heart, believe that Oliver Cromwell was most anxious to forestall future times in establishing tolerance even for Roman Catholics—it was impossible to carry out this idea. Yet all new discoveries that are made in ancient documents,

and all more minute study of the experience of individuals and local churches in those days, give us continually a higher idea of the comprehensive and tolerant spirit that in general actuated the greatest sovereignty that this country ever experienced.

The restoration of Charles II. was in many respects the most disastrous event, the direst curse, this country ever suffered. Yet the persecution it brought on Nonconformity was by no means an unmixed evil. That persecution forced Nonconformists back into their proper duty of prophetic protest. It made them heralds of a wider freedom than it ever entered into their heads to dream of. It was not their theory, it was not their aspiration, but the necessities of their position, that compelled the passage of the Toleration Act. William III. was a man quite shrewd enough to see that it was utterly impossible ever to stamp out religious differences in this country; and his Dutch experience made him comparatively regardless of hierarchical superstitions. He was, therefore, quite ready to make any reasonable compromise which would give peace in his time; and thus it came to pass that he obtained the throne on terms which ensured some limited measure—a very limited measure it afterwards turned out to be—of toleration to those who dissented from the Church as by law established.

Toleration necessarily led afterwards to attempts at comprehension. When attempts at comprehension failed, the supporters of authority were so disappointed and vexed that they recurred as far as they could to methods of persecution, and so for more than a hundred years Dissenters were held to be rightly disabled from taking any public office of any kind unless they would sin against their own consciences, by conforming to the outward rites and ceremonies of the Church. Not until the year 1828 were the Test and Corporation Acts repealed, and the right of all Nonconformists fully acknowledged to take public appointments, municipal positions, or offices under the Crown.

Catholic emancipation followed, as you know, about the same time. It was a long while before the universities were thrown open to Nonconformists, and they are scarcely thrown open yet as wide as they ought to be; and to this day we cry out, apparently in vain, for the full and unlimited proclamation of religious equality to all parties.

That, however, is assured to us. It is impossible for us to draw back in the march of progress upon which we have entered, and if not in our day, at least in the days of our children, the last shreds of intolerance will be swept away from our constitution.

Better, however, than any attempt to tell over again the history of the struggles that have ensued from the persistency of Nonconformity, better is it to attempt some brief summary of what we owe to Nonconformity as a phase of religious development. Very different estimates must necessarily be formed as to the special religious value to be attached to Nonconformity. Indeed, its modes of belief, and its modes of religious action, and

its forms of worship are so endlessly different, that no general judgment can possibly embrace them all. I am content to say that wherever Nonconformity has kept alive its preference for living inspiration over dead tradition there it remains a good thing; there it is still a glorious influence in our land. But wherever it has merely substituted sectarian prejudice for the traditions of a hierarchy, there it is necessarily evil. If I might give illustrations of Nonconformist bodies that have retained for a long time their preference for living inspiration over dead tradition, I could not but refer specially to the Society of Friends. There is no sect amongst the Nonconformists, which in its origin so entirely abandoned all submission to earthly authority in matters of religious opinion or religious worship. There is no religious body that has made greater sacrifices, there is absolutely none that has been so pure in its modes of action. For as you know, neither Presbyterians nor Independents, nor, for the matter of that, Baptists, scrupled to take the sword at times for the maintenance of their own views, or of the power of their own religion. But the followers of Fox have always confined themselves entirely to moral suasion or to passive resistance. And none have ever shown more martyr-like courage in bearing all the ills that a corrupt society could heap upon them rather than soil their consciences. And I cannot but think that the great statesman, whose voice is so recently silenced in the tomb, owed very much indeed of his signal moral influence over the senate and the people of this country to his Quaker training. John Bright had learned in the meeting-house that he attended in early life, near to which his remains now lie, in truly "consecrated" ground, to prefer moral truth to ecclesiastical forms, learned to prefer the direct utterances of an unsophisticated conscience to the quibblings and explanations of an effete theology. John Bright learned that the precious soul of religion is righteousness; and such convictions underlie all the pleadings of his eloquence throughout his long and illustrious career.

I might also, did time permit, allude to the power of inspiration for long possessed by the various Methodist connexions. Whether their inspiration survives as brightly to the present day or not, I will scarcely undertake to say. But there are sporadic movements of Nonconformity, such as those represented by churches scarcely connected with any sect whatever, in which able men—men of profound convictions and of patriotic vigour—I might say like the minister who used to preach in this building, the late Mr. W. J. Fox, have borne testimony to the superiority of present inspirations over effete traditions.

The inspiration does not die away. It may change from place to place; it may assume now one form and now another. It may be associated now with one, and again with another species of genius, but the inspiration is as immortal as humanity.

If I were to attempt to sum up the chief benefits that the country has derived from Nonconformity, I would say they are comprised mainly in the

insistence on toleration, in the union of freedom of thought with reverence, and in the exercise of the arts of self-government.

Toleration, as I have already said, we do not owe directly to Nonconformists. It was not intended by the original Nonconformists themselves; but their persistence in maintaining their own position, and their impotence in attaining anything like supremacy, compelled them to become advocates of toleration, and therefore we do owe it indirectly to them. As to freedom of thought, very little credit can be given to those denominations who associate with the tenure of their most sacred edifices a cut-and-dried but mouldering creed, believed probably by not one in a hundred of their congregation. They would chain men's thoughts if they could, but happily they have found it to be impossible. We do not owe freedom of thought, any more than toleration, directly to Nonconformity; but indirectly we may, because where a number of sects have been arguing and wrangling together, the conviction has gradually dawned upon a practical community that really it does not matter very much what people say about these things so long as they act honestly and uprightly and purely. The conviction has gradually dawned upon the country that it is perfectly safe to allow thought to be free, so long as conduct is right; and in that sense we owe freedom of thought indirectly to Nonconformists.

But there is one characteristic of our English freethought which we owe even more directly to Nonconformity, and that is its alliance with a spirit of reverence. On the Continent you do not find this so often. There for the most part the power of establishments on the one hand, and the mocking scepticism that surrounds them on the other, suggest to us a weight of solemn humbug on the one side, and heartless levity on the other. There is not sufficient appreciation in French or in most German scepticism of the enormous moral advantage that religious struggles have given to the world. But in this country of ours, the variety of forms prevailing amongst Nonconformists and the sacrifices that they have been ready to make for their religious convictions; the friction that has been created amongst these various opinions, and the charity that has gradually been forced upon the holders of these opinions, one towards the other, have all united to bring about finally, not only a law of toleration but a spirit of tolerance. And, moreover, all these influences have tended to bring about a conviction that all forms of religion have had some meaning, and all have been of some value to humanity. Accordingly in this country the progress of freethought is not destructive merely, it is constructive as well. We have learned to value the inspiration given in past times by religion of a theological order; and we are busily, and I hope not without fruit, asking now: How shall this inspiration be supplied from the eternal sources of truth ever open in the visible universe itself?

Finally, we Anglo-Saxons often make our boast that we are better capable of self-government than other races in the world. Not only here but in our colonies we exhibit both imperial and municipal institutions in which

the rights of the individual are for the most part carefully observed while the needs of the community are insisted upon. Hardly, however, do we sufficiently remember one of the sources from which our capacity of self-government has sprung. The source I allude to is the exercise of self-government amongst Nonconformist churches. When first Dissenters from the Establishment met in holes and corners to carry on their own worship, or the various charitable undertakings which have always been connected with religion, they had no official authority to compel any one to keep order—they were necessarily dependent on each other. Each brother had as good a right to express his opinion as any other. They could only rule by the majority, and consequently they began to study the arts of self-government. They found it was necessary to make compromises one with the other ; they found that they must exercise charity. They found that there was great need of patience. And those scorers who ridicule and laugh at the squabbles of deacons and ministers in Nonconformist bodies, and the fights between various sects and parties in “little Bethels,” are blind indeed if they do not perceive that, precisely from such exercises in the art of self-control and self-government as were given in these apparently ignoble places, has gradually been developed to its highest possible extent the power of self-government possessed by the English people. Remember, these little self-governing communities were scattered throughout the land for hundreds of years before we were a free people in the modern sense of the word ; before the franchise was extended to every household. Undoubtedly the poor, who had little advantages of intellectual culture, owed very much to their membership of Methodist chapels, or of Independent meeting houses, or of Baptist churches, in various parts of the country, where they squabbled with each other until they learned to bear with one another in patience and charity.

On the whole, then, I would say that the chief value that we should assign to Nonconformity in the history of this country is not on account of the theological opinions it has advocated, or the theoretical arguments whereby it has maintained them ; but rather on account of its moral and political activity. And they who appraise this rightly will find in Nonconformity one of the most beneficent factors in the evolution of the British nation.

HISTORICAL PRESBYTERIANISM.

BY DAVID FOTHERINGHAM,

Minister of St. John's Presbyterian Church, Tottenham.

THE Reformation forms one of the great epochs of history. It was substantially a transition from the Middle Ages to Modern Times. The world then finished one stage of its course, and entered on a new and more glorious career. Before this period Popery was supreme in the Church, and Feudalism prevailed in the State. These two were both hostile to liberty; and, in outward appearance, there was between them a striking resemblance. At the head of the State there was a despot, and under him there was a long succession of nobles, barons, knights, and squires, bound to execute his will. As for the multitude of the people, they were of little more estimation than the goods and chattels on the estates to which they belonged. They were compelled to do all manner of work for their superiors in time of peace, and to fight for them in their numerous wars. Nor were the people regarded as of more consequence in their relation to the Church. They had no spiritual rights accorded them; they were sheep, not destined to be fed, but to be shorn. Over them also was a clerical caste, rising by regular gradation from the humble curate or parish priest to the Pope, who claimed to be the successor of the apostle Peter and the vicar of Christ, and, in this capacity, affected to perform functions and exercise an authority pertaining rather to a divine being than to any mortal man.

But it could not be expected that the nations should submit for ever to this two-fold yoke. It involved a species of slavery nearly as degrading as that which has cursed the dark continent. It afforded free play for passions of the darkest hue, and it was maintained by privileged orders as rapacious as they were cruel.

The death-knell of this hateful system was rung when Luther hammered his theses on the church door of Wittenberg, on the 31st October, 1517. The movement inaugurated by this daring monk was purely religious, but it was attended by political as well as ecclesiastical results which transformed society, and gave birth to the free institutions of modern times.

Luther was not naturally an agitator or an innovator desiring change for its own sake. On the contrary, he had conservative tendencies, and might have been expected to uphold rather than destroy existing customs. He had also a profound reverence for the Church, of which he was a devoted son, regarding her as the very spouse of Christ; and it

was his burning desire that, purified from her corruptions, she might shine forth, according to the scriptural metaphor, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." In his innocence he appealed to the Papal hierarchy to undertake the reformation which the Church so much needed; but they were deaf to his remonstrances. The Pope replied by a bull of excommunication, pronouncing Luther and his adherents "incorrigible and accursed heretics, whom all princes and magistrates should apprehend and send to Rome, or banish from the country in which they happened to be found." It was then the die was cast. Precluded from agitating for reform within the Church itself, Luther and all who sympathized with him were driven to the necessity of either submitting to her arbitrary authority or continuing their work outside her pale. It was not without a pang they contemplated severance from a Church which inherited splendid traditions, and wielded a magic power, before which the proudest princes had quailed. But their duty was plain. To yield, would have been treachery to their own religious convictions as well as to the word of God, which they acknowledged as of supreme authority; and, therefore, in the sacred name of truth they set up their banners, and, proclaiming their revolt against a corrupt institution which refused all amendment, they constructed new societies which were formed on the foundations laid by Christ and His holy Apostles.

In this departure from Rome there were three Churches which were specially prominent, and which continue with unabated vigour to the present day. These were the Church of England, the Lutheran Church, and the Reformed or Presbyterian group of Churches. These three did not, however, all march abreast, nor did they all travel the same distance. The first to call a halt, encamping almost within sight of the seven-hilled city, was the Church of England. Hence to this day she is only half reformed. Her creed, elaborated by sincere Protestants and learned divines, is sufficiently orthodox to satisfy the most Biblical scholar; but it is to a great extent neutralized by a liturgy which permits a belief in baptismal regeneration, and allows the observance of the Lord's Supper to be transformed into the celebration of the Romish mass. Her retention of a hierarchy, too, has led to grave abuses. Her ministers are separated from the people and formed into a class by themselves, called clerks in holy orders. They naturally assume in consequence priestly functions, inconsistent with popular rights; and through their arrogance, and intolerance, towards the other religious denominations, there has been no little civil as well as social dissension in the country.

The next to stop on the journey was the Church founded by Luther. Though personally an ardent Reformer, and ready to follow truth whithersoever she led him, his conservative instincts prevented him casting off any of the forms or customs of the Church in which he was reared, except such as were expressly condemned by the Word of God. Moreover, becoming alarmed by the wild excesses of some Anabaptists, who attached

themselves to the skirts of his great movement, as well as by the revolt of the peasants against their oppressors, he withheld all valid government of his Church from the people, and placed it in the hands of princes and civil magistrates. A Church formed under such diverse motives was necessarily of a very complex character. Her doctrine was mainly Protestant; but her rites and ceremonies were largely Popish, while her government was thoroughly Erastian. It was, however, in her favour that Luther did not encourage the exaltation of any of the ministers over their brethren. In some countries where the Lutheran Church took root, a class was formed called bishops; but they were and are mere superintendents, and not dispensers of grace to any other class inferior to themselves.

The party that advanced furthest in the march from Rome was the Presbyterian. Amongst the celebrated chiefs of the Reformation who assisted in formulating their principles and bringing them before the world, the first place, in time, is due to Ulrich Zwingli. He was the contemporary of Luther, but was in no sense his disciple or follower. "All deference to Martin Luther," he once observed, "but what we have in common with him we knew long before we had heard his name." Zwingli was born in Switzerland and grew up an ardent patriot, nourished by the traditions of the noble deeds of his ancestors, and loving the liberty and free institutions of his native land.

As the Church of Rome presented many openings through which men of ability and enterprise might rise to the highest dignities, as well as to wealth and power, young Ulrich, on account of his quick wit and budding genius, was early destined to the priesthood. While preparing for this sacred office he had the unspeakable advantage of receiving a good education. He sat at the feet of able and liberal-minded professors, and he proved an apt and diligent pupil. He was an elegant Latin scholar, and he was well versed in classical and patristic literature. He took his degree of M.A. when he was twenty-two years of age, and was thereafter appointed priest of Glarus, a mountainous parish, in a canton of the same name, in his native country. Here he proved a diligent and faithful pastor; but his duties were sufficiently light to allow him time to continue the studies for which he had been distinguished at the university. He also applied himself to Greek, and was soon able to read the New Testament in the tongue in which it was originally written. This proved to be the turning-point in his life. The teaching of the divine book touched his whole being, and under its inspiring influence he became a new creature. He had found sweet waters in many a volume of classic lore, but they had never satisfied the thirst of his longing soul. Here, however, he found a well of water springing up into everlasting life, and, through its fulness, all his wants were abundantly supplied. Now that his eyes were opened he could not help observing that the Church of Rome had removed an immeasurable distance from the Church of the Acts and the Epistles; and, as his convictions became rooted, he made

them known to his humble flock. The commotion that followed was great, and his fame spread abroad. His reputation became known to the dignitaries of the Church which he assailed, and it was proposed to silence him by flattery rather than by force. Messages of regard were sent to him by a special ambassador from Rome, in which the Father of the Church styled this erring priest "his beloved son," and the highest honours the Pope could bestow were literally laid at the heretic's feet. But Zwingli was a child of the mountains, wedded to the simple habits of his countrymen, and for him these blandishments had no attraction.

About the time he reached the vigour of his manhood he was asked to become preacher in the College of Canons at Zurich, and he accepted the invitation. During his ministry here he was assailed by many enemies, and had to stand like a man-at-arms to defend himself against all comers. In all his encounters he bore himself with courage and magnanimity, but as yet there was no worthy tribunal to judge between him and his adversaries. To Pope or Council there lay no appeal, for he was already judged and condemned. In these circumstances he formulated opinions on the government of the Church, in which we find the germ at least of modern Presbyterianism. Accustomed to Republican institutions, in which affairs of State were administered by rulers chosen for this purpose by the sovereign people, it was his desire to set up a corresponding order for adjudication in spiritual affairs. But the time was not yet ripe for such a radical change, and he found it necessary, therefore, to adapt his plans to existing conditions of society. What he wanted was a judicatory truly representing the people, whose authority, in the last degree, he preferred to any other tribunal. Such a judicatory he discovered in the Great Council of Zurich. It was an elected body, and it represented the people of the Canton. The line of demarcation between civil and spiritual authority was not then well understood or defined; but as Zwingli was before his age in other things, so in his views on this subject also, he held doctrines far in advance of his contemporaries. It was on this account that, in determining to submit his cause to the Great Council, he accompanied the offer with conditions binding it to act, not as a civil court, but in a spiritual capacity. His words were, "We, the preachers of the Word of God in Zurich, on the one hand, give the Council of Two Hundred plainly to understand that we commit to them that which properly it belongs to the whole Church to decide, only on the condition that in their consultations and conclusions they hold themselves to the Word of God alone; and, on the other hand, that they only act so far in the name of the Church as the Church tacitly and voluntarily adopts their conclusions and ordinances."

The propositions contained in this pregnant sentence are threefold, and they embrace the principles which are now universally attributed to genuine Presbyterianism. They declare,—

1. That it belongs to the Christian people, simply as believers, to decide all controversies which arise within the Church.

2. That it is expedient for Christian people to elect representatives to act in spiritual matters, on their behalf and in their name.

3. That it is the duty of these representatives to regulate their conduct by the sole authority of the Word of God.

It is a pleasure to think, and it is only just to state, that modern Presbyterianism, which is the purest form of Republicanism, was brought into being as a living and practicable form of Church order in democratic Switzerland. The free Cantons furnished an excellent example both of what it is, and what it should be; and probably, had Zwingli's life been longer spared, he would have developed a complete system of ecclesiastical government on the models which he admired, and with which he was so familiar. But it was not to be. Whilst he was still in the flower of his age, a religious war was kindled among the Cantons themselves. The advocates of the old order determined to bring back the sister States, which had embraced the new faith, to their former allegiance to the Church of Rome. In the war which ensued, Zurich led the van on the Protestant side. Zwingli was appointed chaplain, and accompanied the army to the field. While in the act of performing his duties, he stooped down to breathe some words of consolation into the ear of a dying soldier, and was at the same moment struck by a stone which felled him to the ground. In attempting to rise, he received a fatal stab from a spear, and the blood flowed copiously from the wound. "What matters it?" said he, "they may kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul." These were the last words of this celebrated Reformer. He was only forty-six when this catastrophe took place, and his death at this early age was deeply lamented. His influence was great among those who could not accept the dogma of consubstantiation. As Paul rebuked Peter, because he was to be blamed, so Zwingli had joined in controversy with Luther on this vexed topic, and had no need to be ashamed of the result. He was not only a polished scholar and a learned divine, but he had the qualities which constitute a great statesman. Before his death he was using his utmost endeavours to draw the rulers who were favourable to Protestantism into a league for the defence of their just liberties; but persecution had not yet driven the iron sufficiently deep into their souls to rouse them from their apathy.

With his death this scheme fell to the ground, and many of his friends thought that the work of Reformation too, in which he had taken such an active part, was permanently arrested. But it was otherwise ordered. When this actor disappeared from the arena, another was preparing to enter it who not only took up the work of his predecessor but carried it to a height of which the original labourer had scarcely formed a conception. For an introduction to the successor of Zwingli as chief of the Reformed section of the Protestant Churches, the scene changes from republican Switzerland to monarchical France. About the beginning of the 16th century, a certain Gérard Chauvin, a man of Norman extraction, had his home in Noyon, the seat of a bishopric in Picardy. He was a shrewd

lawyer, and held two important appointments, as Apostolic Notary, and Secretary to the Bishop. To this man was born a son, on the 10th of July, 1509, who received the name of John. From his birth he was delicate, and he grew up a shy and reserved boy. But he showed uncommon intellectual gifts, and so Gérard, with true fatherly instincts, destined him for the Church; and, to prepare him for a good start in the sacred profession, he determined also to give him the best possible education. Fortunately, he had sufficient influence to get the lad instructed with the sons of the chief Baron, residing in that neighbourhood; and through his courteous bearing and polished manners, John ever afterwards showed the advantages which he had reaped from this superior training. But education of this kind was costly, and the prudent Secretary bethought himself of ways and means to meet the expense. A small chaplaincy falling vacant in the See of Noyon, Gérard persuaded the bishop to present the boy to the living, and, from the day of his appointment, he drew the stipend. Nor was this the only piece of ecclesiastical patronage, from which he benefited. He also succeeded at a later period to the curacy of Pont l'Évêque, in Normandy, and derived a modest income from that appointment. True, the boy could not perform any of the duties; but, in those easy-going times, the managing lawyer found no difficulty in providing for this contingency. The youthful John was thus early introduced to the ranks of the priesthood, for though he was never ordained, he received the tonsure, and thus set his foot on the first round of a ladder leading to the highest posts which the Church had to bestow. At the age of fourteen he proceeded to Paris and entered La Marche, a college celebrated for the prelections of Cordier, a professor who was justly esteemed the most elegant Latin scholar of that time. It rarely happens that a youth from the provinces maintains at a public University the reputation acquired at his early home; but the notary's son exceeded all the hopes previously entertained concerning him. At this college he was called Calvin, the Latinized form of his patronymic; and it was by that name he was afterwards distinguished.

While pursuing his studies in Paris, his views underwent a change which affected the whole current of his after life. Though a devout Roman Catholic, omitting no duty prescribed by the most rigid disciplinarian of the Church, he became dissatisfied with his spiritual condition. Yet before man he was blameless. He was not touched by any stain of vice; and his passions as well as his intellect were under the control of a strong will which inclined to righteousness. Nevertheless he was not happy. In this state of mind he happened to turn to the New Testament. He may have searched it before, for proof-texts to support the dogmas of the Church's faith; but now he used it as a means of grace for his distressed soul. Suddenly the scales fell from his eyes. He found in this book a righteousness with which God is well pleased, even the perfect work of Jesus Christ, and appropriating it as his own, by a living faith, he entered

into a peace to which he was formerly a stranger. In after years he grappled with the deepest problems involved in the Christian religion, and had many doubts and fears; but he watched carefully the operations of his own mind, and never saw reason to question the genuineness of the conversion which he underwent in his youth. About the same time, apparently at the request of his father, he went first to Orleans and then to Bourges, to study law. To this fascinating subject he added the acquirement of a knowledge of the Greek tongue, and became familiar with the productions of the Evangelists and Apostles in the dialect in which they were originally written. When he was about twenty, his father died; and feeling free then to follow the bent of his own genius, he returned to Paris and devoted himself to Academic pursuits. At this time there was a great fermentation in the capital as well as in many of the chief towns of France. Earnest men appeared here and there, both within the Church's pale and without it; and while some inveighed against the errors of Popery, others preached the simple doctrines of a purer faith. The Church launched her thunderbolts and the king issued edicts against these innovators, but their number continued to increase. Several were consumed at the stake; but their ashes were scarcely cold before others stepped forward to fill up the ranks which had been thinned by their martyrdom. Calvin was not idle at this juncture, but the path he chose for himself was of the humblest order. Shunning the debates of the forum, he glided from house to house, instructing families in the word of God. Possessing agreeable manners, and having a faculty for ready speech and clear exposition, he persuaded and convinced, and thus made many converts. But, though desiring to remain unseen, he could not be hidden. Indeed, from the first moment that he embraced evangelical truth he became the centre as well as the chief figure of the Reformation in France. But while his solid learning and his humility, his unaffected piety and his commanding abilities gained the ready homage of his friends, the same qualities inspired his enemies with fear and filled them with rage. For this reason he flitted from place to place to save his life. Now we find him south of the Loire, and then north in Normandy. But wherever he went he pursued the same mode of life. He devoted his chief strength to study, and what time he could spare he spent in evangelistic labours. During all this time he had not formally broken with Rome; but when he reached his twenty-sixth year he stood at the parting of the ways, and was obliged to decide as to the hand to which he should turn. At this age, according to the practice of the Roman Church, it was required that he should either renounce the livings to which he was appointed when a boy, or be ordained to the priesthood. There were not wanting timid friends who advised him to retain his charges and become a Reformer within the Church's communion; but Calvin was too sagacious to be imposed upon by such specious counsel, and he was too decided a character to yield to any compromise. "Not one, but a hundred benefices," he said, "would I give up, rather than make myself the Pope's vassal." Ac-

cordingly he repaired to Noyon, and in true lawyer-like fashion, in the presence of the proper officials, he resigned both his chaplaincy and his curacy. This was Calvin's farewell to Rome. This act was like the conduct of a general who burns his bridges to cut off all hope of retreat from the army under his command. Henceforth he cast in his lot with the despised Protestants, prepared for all risks, from the prison to the martyr's crown.

It was at this time he set about a task which he had long revolved, and for which he had prepared himself both in Paris and in Angoulême when fleeing from persecution. Observing that the most revolting crimes as well as doctrines were imputed to the Protestants, sometimes wilfully, and sometimes ignorantly, he determined to draw up a treatise in which he could show to the world what the faith was for which they were contending. He was well aware also that a work of this kind would be useful to the Protestants themselves. Though many of them could die for their religion, they could not all defend it. He wished therefore to put in their hands, not a creed merely, nor a confession, but a popular statement of Christian truth, drawn directly from the Holy Scriptures, and proved to be as much in accordance with right reason as it was adapted to the deepest human need. He desired, in fine, to adduce evidence beyond all contradiction, that though the Reformers had abandoned the communion of the Romish Church, they were neither fanatics nor schismatics, but were in the true line of succession of the Church of the Apostles, from which the Church of Rome had immeasurably swerved. To carry out this project, he retired to Basle, and living in seclusion there from one to two years, devoted himself entirely to this work. It was completed and published in the year 1536, when the author was only twenty-seven; and from the moment it appeared, young as he was, it was felt that he deserved the foremost place in the Protestant ranks, and that honour was ungrudgingly assigned to him. Above all, Rome detected in him her chief adversary; and, henceforth, it was against Calvin she directed her heaviest artillery. The Protestants of every shade now also learned that they had a faith worthy of their most costly sacrifices. Whilst the enthusiasm of revolt against grievous abuses lasts, men may fight for negations; but when the first flush of zeal has passed, they need positive principles by which they can live, and for which they should be prepared to die. This was the great service which Calvin rendered to Protestantism. His book was hailed with delight all over Europe. It brought light to them that were in darkness, it confirmed the wavering, and it supplied a bond of unity to all who agreed with him in his views of divine truth. Nor was it easy to gainsay the conclusions which he sought to establish. This was largely owing to the method of reasoning which he adopted. As there were Reformers before the Reformation, so Calvin was an inductive philosopher before Lord Bacon was born, and he rigorously followed the logic imputed to that father of modern scientists. Forsaking the scholastic forms, which delighted in framing theses from a man's inner consciousness, and then defending them by stiff and irrational syllogisms,

Calvin surveyed the whole range of inspired literature with a calm and clear eye; and then, having collected his facts, he classified them and deduced the principles to which they indubitably pointed. The *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, as he styled his book, was thus a great as well as an original work. It exercised a paramount influence when it first appeared, and the impression it then produced is not yet exhausted. Though he had no predecessor in the field, he has had many successors. Some of these have here and there subjected the facts to a closer scrutiny, or arranged them according to an improved order, or even given them a truer interpretation; but the work of the great master has never been completely superseded. Considering the important place given to the history of the founding and constitution of the Church in the Word of God, it was to be expected that Calvin would not overlook this subject, and we find accordingly that he has devoted to it about a third of his book.

Though the word Presbyterian does not even occur in the *Institutes*, it can be easily shown that the essential characteristics distinguishing the group of Churches to which this name is applied are contained in the chapters dealing with this subject, and it may therefore now be expedient to state these characteristics in order, as well as to show their origin and the benefits derived from their adoption.

1. Presbyterianism pays due regard to the members of the Church, and secures them in the enjoyment of their spiritual rights and privileges. They are esteemed as the children of God, and, as such, they are entitled to the administration of all means of grace, including admission to divine ordinances. Though they are not rulers themselves, the right of government springs from them: for it is by their suffrages that any of their number are raised to office, and to them those who exercise authority usually report their proceedings. It will thus be observed that there is no radical distinction between the electors and their rulers. They belong to the same class and substantially enjoy the same advantages. Among Presbyterians, therefore, the invidious division into clergy and laity has no place; and due provision is made to preserve the even balance of power between the holders of office and the people.

2. The next important point in Presbyterianism is ministerial parity.

From the use of two words in the New Testament employed to designate those who held spiritual office in the Primitive Church it was maintained by the theologians of the Church of Rome, and in this respect they are followed by Prelatists generally, that the priesthood consists of three orders, viz., Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. The deacons formed an inferior class, being debarred from the exercise of certain rites, such as the consecration of the sacramental elements and pronouncing absolution. The presbyters enjoyed greater privileges than the deacons, but were subordinate to the bishops, who exercised authority over dioceses and administered ordination both to those who were received into their own order and to the other two orders inferior to themselves.

Calvin agreed with his adversaries in regarding the deacons as a distinct order in the Church; but he maintained that their office was secular, and not spiritual. Their duty, he explained, was to take the oversight of the temporal affairs of the congregations only; and in this contention he has been followed by all sound Presbyterians.

But the chief conflict raged around the position which Calvin took up regarding bishops and presbyters. He zealously maintained that the presbyter was qualified to perform every spiritual duty required of a minister of Jesus Christ, and denied that there was any valid ground for the distinction between his office and that of a bishop. He admitted the use of the two words, Bishop and Presbyter, in the New Testament, to represent men who were engaged in spiritual service; but he showed that they were used interchangeably, and as they therefore designated one and the same office, there was an equality among all those who held that office. Great objection was taken to this doctrine of ministerial parity, and the controversy has since been carried on with considerable asperity on both sides. But, as discussion proceeds and candour grows, the best scholars are coming to be of Calvin's opinion. No one could suspect Gibbon of partiality to Presbyterian views, yet he observed that "the two appellations Bishops and Presbyters appear, in their first origin, to have distinguished the same office and the same order of persons." But a greater authority on this subject is Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham, who was one of the most exact and learned scholars of the present age. Though a member of the Episcopal bench himself, he abandoned the ancient line of defence of his order, remarking, "It is a fact now generally recognised by theologians of all shades of opinion, that, in the language of the New Testament, the same officer in the Church is called indifferently Bishop and Elder." Nothing more need be said on the subject. Whatever authority may be found for Episcopacy from the practice of the Church after apostolic times we care not. Our appeal does not lie to fallible men like ourselves, but to teachers and guides who claimed to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance. Nor can we forget, in such a case as this, the emphatic declaration of our Lord, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

3. The third distinctive feature of Presbyterianism is the association of ruling elders with the minister who preaches and dispenses the sacraments. The great danger of the Church arises from the tendency, not to say the ambition, of ministers to constitute themselves lords over God's heritage, arrogating to themselves the power of dispensing grace, or the right of exercising discipline according to their own pleasure. Presbyterianism places an insuperable barrier in the way of any attempt of this kind. In the management of congregational affairs there can never be less than two elders present with the minister, while in superior courts care is taken that there shall always be at least a numerical equality. These elders are the very backbone of the Presbyterian system. They are the *élite* of the congregations, and are chosen for high qualifications, such as piety, zeal,

wisdom, or conspicuous ability. They are, generally speaking, shrewd and enterprising gentlemen, engaged in secular pursuits, and, though they uphold the minister in his proper sphere, they are the very last persons to permit him to lord it over the flock, or assume priestly functions.

4. The last distinctive characteristic of Presbyterianism is organic unity.

The first example of such unity is found in the congregation. The people who join its membership form a brotherhood having equal rights and privileges. This congregation manages its own affairs, through its elders and deacons; and due care is taken that there shall be no encroachment on its independence. The Elders' Court passes by different names, but in our country it is called the Session. Presbyterianism, however, requires that congregations existing in the same district should be confederated for purposes common to the whole; and, when this combination is formed, they are all placed under a Court consisting of an equal number of ministers and ruling elders, and these represent the Sessions which preside over the congregations. In our country this court is called a Presbytery, and it renders important services to all the congregations within its bounds. It exercises a brotherly supervision over them, strengthening the weak, preventing scandal and strife, and encouraging all in the due performance of their spiritual duties.

Rising by gradation above the Presbyteries are Provincial Synods and General Assemblies. As their names indicate, these differ in accordance with the areas of which they have the oversight, the Synod exercising authority over several Presbyteries included in its bounds, while the jurisdiction of the Assembly extends to the *whole* of the country in which the Church is situated. But they differ also in constitution. The membership of the Synod is drawn from the Sessions in the same way as the members of a Presbytery, while the membership of the Assembly is composed of an equal number of elders and ministers chosen by the Presbyteries as their representatives.

By such a combination a real unity is established among the congregations belonging to a particular Church. As members of an organic body, they form a true brotherhood and take an interest in each other's welfare. In some instances the links which weld them together are so close that they all contribute to a common fund from which the ministers' stipends are paid. By such an arrangement the poorest congregation gets the benefit of the services of a thoroughly qualified pastor; and, as at the same time due care is taken that it does not shirk its own duty up to the measure of its ability, its independence and self-respect are sufficiently maintained.

In the same way, the unity of the Presbyterian Church affords ample security for the administration of justice. By a fundamental law of her constitution it is well known that the humblest member of any congregation may approach all the courts, from the Session to the General Assembly, to state a complaint, or ask redress for some grievance. It may happen

that in the first instance, from personal animosities, justice may fail; but in the superior courts, which are free from local prejudices, it is uniformly obtained.

It only remains to add that, in the fertile imagination of Calvin the idea was revolved of extending this organic unity far beyond the congregations in a given country. He sighed for a time when all the Churches of the world could be confederated for mutual counsel and help. Writing to Archbishop Cranmer, who had invited him to attend a Conference of divines of various Churches, proposed to be held in London, to assist in drawing up a sound Protestant Constitution for the Church of England, he said, "One of the greatest evils of the time is that the Churches are so widely separated from each other, that there is not even a temporal or human intercourse carried on between them. . . . The body of Christ is torn asunder because the members are separated. So far as I am concerned, if I can be of any use I will readily pass over ten seas to effect the object in view. . . . When our purpose is to unite the sentiments of all good and learned men, and so, according to the rule of Scripture, to bring the separated Churches into one, neither labour nor trouble of any kind ought to be spared."

This devout aspiration was not only not realized in Calvin's life-time, but it was doomed to lie dormant for more than 300 years. But it contained a vital germ, and within the last quarter of the present century it has burst forth and borne magnificent fruit. A General Council was held in Edinburgh in the year 1877, at which representatives from most of the Presbyterian Churches in the world were present, and at which an alliance was formed for mutual encouragement and co-operation in their common work. Three meetings have been held since, one in Philadelphia, another in Belfast, and the last in London; and arrangements are now made for their periodical return once every three or four years. In constituting this Council the crowning of the edifice of Presbyterian unity was accomplished. All Churches belonging to this family are now welded into a compact body; and, as they are all animated by a kindred spirit, they work together for the common good, and, if necessity arises, they will also stand by one another when threatened with a common danger. The effect of this union, even within the last fifteen years, has been truly grand. It has given a fresh impulse to some of the struggling Churches on the Continent of Europe; and those of them which were persecuted and ready to perish, knowing the strength of the forces behind them, and warmed by the breath of brotherly sympathy, have risen to vindicate their rights and demand independence.

Considering the lofty conceptions of Church organization which Calvin entertained, and expounded in a variety of forms, it sounds like irony to say that, in Geneva, where he exercised his own ministry, they were not fully put into practice. This arose from the peculiarity of the civil government of the city and the factious opposition which he encountered from

some of the rulers. Nevertheless, he did a great work in that little Republic. Under his influence the city, which was formerly notorious for its profligacy, became as distinguished for its sobriety and sanctity. Strangers flocked to it from all quarters, some to find a refuge from the persecutions which prevailed in their own countries, and others simply to sit at the feet of Calvin and be taught by him. From this city, too, as from a watch-tower, for a period of about twenty years, he surveyed the conflict raging between Popery and the reformed Churches, and, as occasion required, he guided the course of the battle. The advocates of the Reformed Faith were dear to him. He pleaded for them, he gave them wise advice, he rejoiced with them in their prosperity, and he sympathized with them in their distress. It was thus that the broad stamp of his genius was first attached to the badners of these Churches, and remains conspicuously displayed to the present hour.

Literally worn out with labours, Calvin died at the early age of fifty-four, in the year 1564. By his own directions he was buried as a simple citizen in the common cemetery of Geneva; and not a stone or memorial of any kind was erected over the spot to show where his ashes were interred. Many eulogiums have been pronounced over him by famous men in sympathy with his views; but nothing can exceed the tribute of praise rendered to his memory by Ernest Renan, an author at issue with him in many of his distinctive principles. He says:—"In an age and in a country which called for a reaction towards simple Christianity, Calvin succeeded because he was the most Christian man of his generation."

The system of government as well as of doctrine recommended by Calvin was adopted by many Protestant communities throughout the continent of Europe; and though they have all passed through trying vicissitudes, the majority of them remain to this day. There are no less than twenty-six fully organized Churches of this type, representing continental countries, in alliance with the General Council, while there are single congregations here and there of the same order which could not be conveniently attached.

The largest is the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. Its foundations were laid in troublous times. Motley says, "The early reformers were mainly Huguenots in their belief," and, he adds, "the scaffold had its daily victims, but did not make a single convert. These were men who dared and suffered as much as men can dare and suffer in this world, and for the noblest cause which can inspire humanity."

Next in size comes the Reformed Church of France. This Church had in some respects a bright morning. Its principles were espoused by princes and nobles, and it treated on equal terms with statesmen and the ambassadors of kings. But the fair sky was soon overcast with clouds. Though never subdued, it was oppressed, and the blood of its martyrs flowed like water. From their ranks sprang Henry IV., who granted the Edict of Nantes to secure them in the due exercise of their religious rights

and liberties. But, in spite of this shield, his immediate successor began a persecution of the most wanton description. Law and treaties were trampled under foot, while barbarous cruelties of the most revolting character were inflicted on the unhappy sufferers. In this conduct, however, he was even exceeded by his infamous son, Louis XIV. Through his repeal of the Edict of Nantes, the poor Huguenots were placed outside the pale of all law, and a fierce soldiery was turned loose to work their will on the unhappy victims. The inhuman conduct of these monsters baffles all description. Neither sex, nor age, nor rank was spared, while at the same time their goods were pillaged and their homes given to the flames. Then began an exodus, not unlike the flight from Egypt. It is computed that from 300,000 to 400,000 left their native country, and sought refuge from oppression in other lands. They were a sober, enterprising, and industrious race, and they enriched the countries which afforded them shelter by their learning, their manufactures, and their science. The remnant that still clung to their homes, held secret meetings under cloud of night or in inaccessible places, and was called in consequence the Church in the desert. They ran great risks, and endured much; but they preserved the historical continuity of their Church till 1789, when the Constituent Assembly granted them full toleration. Since that time they have slowly but surely extended their borders. They are now full of zeal and enterprise, and, according to their strength, are striving to leaven France with the glorious Gospel.

Besides these two Churches, there are many smaller communities of the Presbyterian family in other countries of Europe. They have a strong footing in many of the German States, as well as in Hungary, Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, and Italy. According to the returns furnished to the General Council of which they are members, there are in all about 5,000 Presbyterian ministers in these countries, and 634,000 communicants. Besides other enterprises in which they seek to do good, they have twenty-four colleges for the instruction of their preachers, and there are eighty periodicals devoted to their interests. Their chief hindrance arises from the shackles imposed upon them by their respective States; but by-and-by these will be cast off, and then, left free to do their legitimate work in their own way, they will doubtless rival, if not excel, the exploits of their heroic ancestors.

The man who ranks next in authority to Calvin in Presbyterian circles is John Knox, a native of a small and poor country, which for many reasons might have been overlooked by the leaders of public opinion in the sixteenth century. Yet it was in humble Scotland that a drama was then enacted which has visibly affected the history of the world. This was largely owing to the character of the man that guided the movement there which we call the Reformation. Knox was a contemporary of Calvin, and he was also an admirer of that remarkable man; but he was too independent a thinker to be his slavish follower. He lived some time at Geneva, as

minister of the English refugees who were settled there in the reign of Queen Mary; but he had formed his own views on Church discipline before he became personally acquainted with the great French Reformer. Under Knox the Reformed Church of Scotland was established on a purely Presbyterian basis; and, though the tree of his planting has been often shaken by violent storms, it has never been entirely uprooted, and to-day its wide-spreading branches practically fill the land. One good reason for such stability is, that, from the beginning, and all through its history, it has been the Church of the masses, and not of the classes. It was alleged by the late Mr. Buckle that the Scotch people were as much priest-ridden as the superstitious Spaniards. A greater mistake could not be made. In the Scotch Presbyterian Church the people had their rights accorded them, and they have freely shed their blood to maintain them. The minister is, indeed, much more the servant of the people than the people can be said to be subject to the minister. This excellent arrangement was largely due to the sagacity of Knox. He did not despise dignities; but, recognising that rulers existed for the people, and not the people for them, he considered popular interests in all the arrangements which he recommended, and the outcome was an advanced type of Presbyterian government. He did not accomplish this object without much opposition; but he was as resolute as he was wise, and consequently he never flinched from his task. A striking sketch of the man and his work has been drawn by Carlyle, which deserves to be known, and can bear repetition. He said:—"In our island there arose a Puritanism which even got itself established as a Presbyterianism and national Church among the Scotch, which came forth as a real business of the heart, and has produced in the world very notable fruit. In some senses one may say it is the only phasis of Protestantism that ever got to the rank of being a faith, a true heart communication with heaven, and of exhibiting itself in history as such. We must spare a few words for Knox: himself a brave and remarkable man; but still more important as Chief Priest and Founder, which one may consider him to be, of the faith that became Scotland's, New England's, Oliver Cromwell's. . . . This that Knox did for his nation, I say, we may really call a resurrection as from death. It was not a smooth business; but it was welcome, surely, and cheap at that price, had it been far rougher. . . . The people began to *live*; they needed first of all to do that, at what cost and costs soever. Scotch literature and thought, Scotch industry; James Watt, David Hume, Walter Scott, Robert Burns; I find Knox and the Reformation acting in the heart's core of every one of these persons and phenomena. . . . Knox is the one Scotchman to whom, of all others, his country and the world owe a debt. . . . He bared his heart to the battle; had to row in French galleys; wander forlorn in exile, in clouds and storms; was censured, shot at through his windows; had a right sore fighting life; if this world were his place of recompense, he had made but a bad venture of it. He had a right sore fight, but he

won it. 'Have you hope?' they asked him in his last moment, when he could no longer speak. He lifted his finger, 'pointed upwards with his finger,' and so died." This eloquent eulogium may be fitly followed by Regent Morton's epitaph over his open grave: "There lies he that never feared the face of man."

When Knox departed this life, his mantle fell on Andrew Melville, a man in many respects as notable as his predecessor. He was a profound scholar, and he was more careful than Knox himself to draw the line where civil government ended and religious liberty began. King James was already on the throne, and had imbibed the notion, as he himself taught, "that a principal part of the king's function consists in ruling the Church; that parity among ministers is irreconcilable with monarchy, and the mother of confusion; and, in short, that Episcopacy should be set up and the principal Presbyterian ministers banished from the country." The truth is, that James had resolved on the absolute despotism which he intended to impose on all his dominions; and, finding the Presbyterians crossing his path, he was bent on their overthrow. To his craft as well as his violence Melville offered a stout resistance, and on a memorable occasion addressed him in a strain to which monarchs are not much accustomed. James had answered a deputation "in a most crabbed and coleric manner," on which Melville, who was a member, took the king by the sleeve, and first calling him God's silly vassal, added, "Therefore, sir, as divers times I have told you before, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of the Commonwealth; and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James VI. is; and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member." This intrepid minister was rajoled to come up to London, after James had ascended the English throne, under the pretence that his counsel was needed to settle Church affairs; but as soon as the king had him in his power, he threw him into prison, and fixed on him a charge of treason for libelling the bishops. On his trial, Bancroft, Bishop of London, called him a traitor; but he was scarcely prepared for the retort that followed. The prisoner replied, "My lords, Andrew Melville was never a traitor. But, my lords, there was one Richard Bancroft (let him be sought for), who, during the life of the late queen, wrote a treatise against his majesty's title to the crown of England, and here (pulling the *corpus delicti* from his pocket), here is the book." Bancroft was covered with confusion; but Melville had not done with him. Advancing gradually as he spake to the head of the table, he took hold of the bishop's lawn sleeves, and calling them Romish rags, added, "If you are the author of the book called 'English Scottising for Genevan Discipline,' I regard you as the capital enemy of all the Reformed Churches in Europe; and, as such, I will profess myself an enemy to you and your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of my blood."

Such an outburst on the part of a prisoner was not, of course, politic;

but there are times when plainness of speech is wiser than discretion. One thing was, however, clear, as James was accustomed blasphemously to say, "that Presbytery and Monarchy could no more agree than God and the devil;" and so this champion of constitutional liberty was banished the kingdom. It was from men of this stamp that the Scottish Church received the robust character which it has ever since retained. Under the Stuarts they passed through a baptism of fire; but in the midst of the flames the great majority clung with tenacity to their favourite Presbyterianism.

After the Revolution in 1689, a series of encroachments were made on the spiritual independence of the Church of Scotland, which culminated in a decision of the Court of Session rendering the call of the communicants to a properly qualified preacher to be their minister as worthless as a piece of waste paper. Against this invasion of popular rights there had been sundry voices raised; but the Evangelicals, as they were called, from whom these protests came were long in a minority, and their opposition therefore was fruitless. But the tide turned in 1834; and then began the conflict with the civil courts, which terminated with the memorable Disruption. The central figure of that movement was the renowned Thomas Chalmers. He was a man remarkable in many ways. He was the most eloquent preacher of his time; he was an ardent social reformer; he was a distinguished professor both of philosophy and theology; he possessed great powers of reasoning and persuasion; and as he also led a consistent Christian life, and had a nobility of character which all admired, he was well fitted to be a leader in a struggle which assumed national proportions. He was at this time at the zenith of his fame. Honours had been showered upon him from many quarters. He was a D.C.L. of the University of Oxford, and he was also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and a corresponding member of the Royal Institute of France. Under his guidance the Evangelicals were led to a certain and glorious victory. On the 18th of May, 1843, 474 ministers, rather than surrender their spiritual rights, relinquished their livings; and, with Chalmers at their head, constituted the Free Church of Scotland. It was a heroic sacrifice and a noble concession to the claims of conscience. It was for the maintenance of these ministers that Chalmers devised the scheme of ecclesiastical finance now so well known as the Sustentation Fund. Availing himself of the organic unity of the Church, which is a fundamental principle of Presbyterianism, he demonstrated the obligation of each congregation to contribute for the support of the whole Church, and the corresponding obligation of the whole Church to provide for the necessities of each congregation. The Sustentation Fund was not, therefore, an eleemosynary scheme through which the rich helped the poor, but a generous arrangement by which poor and rich were knit together in the closest bonds of brotherhood, and every man was induced, from the highest motives, to exercise the gift of liberality according to his ability. By this plan the

members of the Church voluntarily assessed themselves for the support of religious ordinances ; and, as the collectors called for the subscriptions with uniform regularity, there was a constant flow of money towards the central exchequer.

There were also regular seasons for disbursement ; and on these occasions all the ministers received an equal dividend. So successful was this effort, that in the very year of the Disruption, apart from supplements received directly from their own people, a moderate stipend was obtained for every minister who cast in his lot with the Free Church ; and the ground then gained has not only been maintained, but considerably extended. But this achievement has had results which Chalmers did not foresee, and of which he might not have approved. It has been an experiment on a large scale, proving the possibility of maintaining a Church in full efficiency without national endowments, and it has therefore greatly quickened the agitation for delivering all Churches both from State support and State control.

Chalmers did not long survive the Disruption. Without any alarming symptoms of illness, he retired to rest on Sabbath evening the 30th of May, 1847, and next morning was found dead in his bed. His remains were borne to Grange Cemetery, Edinburgh, amid much lamentation ; and the whole Church of God, wherever he had been known, mourned his loss.

The history of Presbyterianism in England is the strangest perhaps on record. It flourishes best on a free soil ; and from the well-known attachment of the inhabitants of the country to liberty, it might naturally have been expected that they would receive this form of Church polity with open arms. Yet, from a variety of causes, the English Presbyterian Church is one of the smallest of the religious communities in the land. To understand this peculiarity, it will be necessary to give an outline of the efforts that were made to graft this system of government on the National Church. Henry VIII. scarcely deserves the credit of being a Reformer at all. He certainly deposed the Pope as the head of the English Church ; but by the Act of Supremacy he was raised to that dignity himself. Apart from him there was a deep religious movement, with a strong current flowing in a Presbyterian direction, which he checked by the exercise of his arbitrary power. Under his son this system was encouraged ; and had he lived to reach his majority, it would certainly have been developed.

Elizabeth was as arbitrary as her father, and by a series of cruel enactments, endeavoured to impose an outward uniformity of worship on all her subjects ; but Presbyterianism had taken too strong a hold on the minds of many of them to be suppressed. Perry, the High Church historian, says, "The main body of the Elizabethan Bishops were both Calvinistic in doctrine and inclined to Presbyterianism in discipline." The Stuarts were the natural enemies of Presbyterianism, and the abettors of Episcopacy. It was a common saying of James, "No bishop, no king."

In the Long Parliament, which took arms against Charles I., the

majority of the members were Presbyterian. They abolished Episcopacy ; and to aid them in framing a polity to take its place, they summoned the famous Westminster Assembly to deliberate on this subject. It consisted originally of ten Peers, twenty members of the House of Commons, and 121 divines, but there were seldom more than an average of from sixty to eighty in attendance. They represented all prominent shades of religious opinion, and they were all held in estimation as men of great learning and ability. They were ultimately joined by six Scotchmen, who took an active part in their proceedings. The Assembly sat from five to six years, and by the end of that time they had drawn up a Confession of Faith, a Directory for Public Worship, and a form of Church Government, all of which were in due course submitted to Parliament, and, with some alterations, adopted as the new constitution of the National Church. This formed the climax of Presbyterian ascendancy, but by the time it reached this height there were forces at work to procure its overthrow. In the first place, Parliament brought odium on the scheme by an endeavour to impose it on the country with pains and penalties in every case of its rejection. Then Cromwell, fresh from his victories, appeared on the scene, and paid little regard to the ordinances of a Parliament for which he had conceived a supreme contempt. But the labours of the Assembly were not on that account lost. Though the effort to set up a Presbyterian Church, under legal sanctions, proved abortive, yet the Westminster standards, which the Assembly had produced, were adopted as symbols by the best Presbyterian Churches in the world. Scotland substituted them for its own Books of Discipline ; English emigrants carried them to America, and they have since formed a rallying-point for English-speaking people all over the world. They have been condemned by many who either never read them or never took the trouble to master their contents ; but it is easier to revile than to refute them. They are the ripe fruit of much anxious deliberation ; they are severely logical, and the propositions cover whole volumes of controversy of which they are the legitimate outcome. These books form England's chief contribution to Presbyterianism, and in bestowing it, no greater service could be rendered to any religious denomination.

With the restoration of Charles II., in spite of all promises to the contrary, Episcopacy was re-imposed on the country ; and, to make matters worse than they had ever been before, the Act of Uniformity was passed, which, for the first time, reduced the Church of England to the level of a sect, and cut her off from all genuine fellowship with her Reformed sisters in other lands. Though some Presbyterians accepted the galling yoke prepared for their necks, there were upwards of 2000 ministers who abandoned their livings rather than surrender the principles which they had deliberately adopted. No greater sacrifice for truth was ever perhaps made. The story of the ejection is a record of bitter privations, enough, even at this time, to make our ears tingle. Yet the

surrender of their benefices did not exempt them from further molestation. A series of persecuting edicts were passed against them, on account of which they were unable to maintain any organic unity. For this reason they became disintegrated; and losing hope of recovering their former status in the National Church, or maintaining an isolated position outside its pale, so many of them were merged into other communions that at the end of 200 years they had nearly disappeared. In the year 1836, however, the scattered congregations were again consolidated, and a work of reconstruction began which is still in process. The Presbyterian Church of England at the present time has as many as eleven Presbyteries and 288 Congregations. It maintains a College for the education of its students, and has a central fund out of which a minimum stipend of £200 per annum is paid to all its ministers. It is also full of evangelistic zeal, and does its fair share in helping to raise the lapsed masses of society. Many of its preachers are men of popular gifts, and draw large congregations. Altogether it is radiant with hope, and bids fair, at its present rate of progress, to recover the high place it once occupied in the country.

In any review of Presbyterianism, the Church with that policy in Ireland ought not to be omitted. It is one of the most vigorous members of the whole Presbyterian family, and has rendered great service to the country in which it is situated. Many other parts of unhappy Ireland appear to be under a deadly blight; but Ulster, the chief home of the Presbyterians, is a hive of industry, and resembles a richly cultivated garden.

But the largest Churches of this type are found in the United States of America. It would have been strange had it been otherwise. The civil government of that country resembles the Presbyterian polity so much that one can imagine some shrewd elder or minister had a hand in constructing the political framework of our transatlantic cousins. Presbyterianism also flourishes in all our colonies. It seems to suit the enterprising habits of these young communities.

Altogether, the Presbyterian Church in its collective capacity forms the largest Protestant sect in the world.

There are four million communicants on her rolls; and by a modest computation there should be not less than twenty millions professing her faith and receiving the benefit of her ordinances.

We may well bid her God-speed. Though her children have not always been blameless, nor her creed always pure, yet she contains in her constitution the seeds of her own regeneration. She has always been in the van of Reformers, and has materially assisted in advancing every true and noble enterprise. She especially adapts her worship to intelligent men. She appeals to reason, and promotes conviction by argument. She has always been the friend of education; and the highest ornaments of science have not infrequently been drawn from her ranks.

Old institutions are to-day upon their trial, and none will be spared that do not serve some useful purpose.

Should any Presbyterian Church be cast into the crucible, it is to be hoped that it will come through the ordeal like gold tried in the fire seven times purified. In common with all other religious denominations, the chief mission of the Presbyterian Church is to proclaim salvation to lost men, and its organization will only be prized in so far as it is conducive to this great end. It should never be forgotten that the Church is a Theocracy, possessing a spiritual life derived directly from the baptism and indwelling of the Holy Ghost ; and every organization should be the outward expression of this new life. With this renewed mind the Presbyterian system is in full harmony, and is therefore worthy of the confidence of all who desire to see the kingdom of God set up in this world. In the external symbols of its faith and worship alterations may be made to suit the varying minds of changing men, but the principles of Presbyterianism should be retained in their integrity. They have been tried and not found wanting ; they rest on the twofold basis of reason and revelation ; they combine liberty with order ; they administer an even-handed justice to the humblest as well as to the highest ; and through them the popular forces are evoked, before which evil is overcome and righteousness is established in the earth. The members of the Presbyterian Churches have no need indeed to be ashamed of the faith in which they have been nurtured, and it is their duty, wherever they go, to hold up its standard and keep its banners flying.

INDEPENDENCY, OR LOCAL CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

BY THE REV. EDWARD WHITE

(Ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales).

Nearly forty years ago I spent ten years of my life in the little western city of Hereford on the Wye, where, among our ten thousand people, we had religious folk of almost every species known in England: Anglicans of every type—High Church, Broad Church, Low Church; Roman Catholics; Methodists of each section—Wesleyan, Primitive, New Connection; Quakers; Baptists; Plymouth Brethren, of two or three shades, hived in separate "rooms," who loved God so much that they would scarcely speak to one another in the streets; Congregationalists; Unitarians; and professors of every type of Modern Agnosticism and Nothingarianism, together with a few active Infidels and Atheists. It was a strange experience. It was also an interesting opportunity. I was intimate with specimens of almost each variety of thought and character, from Deans and Canons and Roman Catholic Priests, down to hyper-Calvinists and God-denying materialists, who had revolted altogether against modern Christianity. It was a position almost resembling that of Noah in the ark, where one could study close at hand every species, sometimes well-nigh watching their evolution of varieties and transformations. I was almost the only person in the city who seemed to wish to know all sects and parties; and, though not popular with any of them, they taught me many things which subsequent experience in this vast sea of souls in London has only confirmed during the subsequent forty years.

One of the chief of these lessons in the natural history of religion was the perception of the fact that all really good and God-fearing men are very much alike *inside*. If you could, as Plato somewhere imagines, cleave them down the centre, and lay open a section of their inmost characters, you would find them all, including many of the doubters, earnest for truth-seeking, provided you did not expect them to seek truth outside their own little sheepfolds, for then the passion for truth-seeking begins to diminish in intensity; men are so much more under the influence of their friends and acquaintances than of abstract conscientious considerations. And yet, within these limits how much one could learn to love and admire round the whole circle! All the good men—I do not say all the professedly *religious* men, or all the pretenders—seemed to desire the right, and tried to enjoy the lower pleasures of life with due regard to the higher delights and duties possible to mankind. All the good men were diligent,

generous, temperate, hospitable, and truth-speaking ; clean-handed, reverent, and compassionate. And one had the feeling that, if their souls could have been taken out of their bodies, and especially out of the religious or non-religious bodies to which they belonged, they would together have composed a Catholic and Apostolic Church, which would have proved a mighty force against the powers of darkness in that Cathedral City, which indeed were considerable both in the lay and clerical departments.

We see modern Christianity under many disadvantages. The full breadth and depth of abstract Christianity is now found only, I think, in its own original documents, which are strikingly different from the more developed creeds and churches of later Christendom. If the Apostles had gone forth to attack Judaism, or the heathenism of the Greeks and Romans and Asiatics, with the *Athanasian Creed*, or the *Assembly's Catechism*, or the *Declaration of Faith* of the Methodist or Presbyterian or Congregational bodies in one hand, and the Cross in the other, I suppose no one thinks they would have had much success in the overthrow of ancient Paganism. The stupidity and ignorance of multitudes of both saints and sinners, believers and unbelievers, is an enormously powerful factor in the history of the world ; though it is undoubtedly far better to have one eye than to have none, or even to have a cast in your one eye than to be stone blind.

I fear we must admit that the impartial and passionate search for truth is not so common an attribute of humanity as some imagine it to be. Thinking generally leads to the dissatisfaction of the set in which you are born, and that prospect, with the practical consequences following, seems to make a man think twice, before he thinks with the desperate resolution of perfect honesty in any direction.

Nevertheless, religious men are more closely related together within than often appears on the surface ; just as one might think the whale a fish because he flounders and dives in the deep sea ; whereas he is not a fish, but a hot-blooded mammal, and first cousin to the amphibious mammals both in skeleton and physiological structure, and is a fish only in his environments ; just as many of us who are Congregationalists feel, thank God, much more closely related to the excellent Canon who lectured to you last Sunday afternoon than we do to some outward and congenital types of Nonconformity.

Your wish to hear some account of different "Centres of Spiritual Activity" has interested me much, although I cannot pretend to offer Independency to you as a short and easy road to the land of Beulah. I was born on this roadside, and one of the best things I have to say of it is, that the Independents of to-day persecute you and punish you less than any other set of religious people known to me for your individual beliefs on serious questions. As much as most men living I have gone against some of the theological principles which they hold in common with other reli-

gious bodies, and against some others special to themselves and their traditions; and yet they made me their Chairman by a pretty unanimous vote two years ago. And I felt much more confident of having been chosen to that post as a sign of catholic brotherhood, than as a sign of advancing sympathy with my particular opinions. The original Independents of the Tudor and Stuart reigns were, I suspect, what we should now think a rather narrow and obstinate set of men, full of conscience, and very godly, but rather fierce and bitter in their goodness, and ready to behave to Queen Elizabeth in such a manner as to make us wonder less at her desire to hang them; and under the Stuarts ready to become fighting Cromwellian Ironsides, if you did not at once fall in with their decisions in theology and ecclesiastical affairs. But the modern Independents have laid aside the sword for the pen, and, I think, have learned the noble lesson of tempering their love of freedom and of local Church government by the ruling influence of the Divine Spirit of sympathy, and by a readiness to submit to that influence in religion, however made known, by learning, judgment, and criticism.

Without pretending to set them up as exceptionally wise men, I venture to think that their history has taught them some lessons of exceeding value in assisting the development of minds moving in the midst of our modern chaos of conflicting beliefs and no beliefs. My duty, however, is not so much to praise or defend the Independents as to describe them, and classify them amidst other varieties of militant Christians. I believe most of their leading men would agree with me in saying that their attachment to Independency is built rather on its being less of an ecclesiastical system than any other known in England, except that of the Open Communion Baptists, who are Independents with one ritualistic difference. The main attraction is a readiness for local union with all sincere and obedient Christians as soon as ever the said local Christians of different colours are wishful to unite with them on a broad basis in worship, in work, and in public usefulness. The very wideness of their aspirations works, however, in some degree against their success. A good party-cry has always more attractive power over the vulgar crowd than a great truth, and a well upholstered ritual has a better chance of popularity than either. Music, and dress, and office, are lawful accompaniments of every combination; but we hold that they ought to take a secondary place in a religion which deals chiefly with the unseen and eternal in both God and Man. It is to the *credit* of the Christian Scriptures that they are too full of thought and aspiration to be the textbook of ecclesiastical milliners and mantua makers; or of people who go almost mad with rage if you even offer to argue with them on any one of their so-called "Articles of Faith." You cannot even imagine St. Paul's letters being addressed to the parishioners of a great London parish. The ratepayers of St. Pancras or St. Marylebone, I am sure, would consider the Epistle to the Romans utterly unintelligible if addressed to them. And yet it originally was addressed to a recently con-

verted company of Jews and Greeks and Romans. Early Christianity was a far more *intellectual* movement than it sometimes gets credit for, to say nothing of its moral qualifications. Each Church was an intellectual and moral *Ecclesia*, or selection of the fittest.

Now the attractions of this system to the Independents lie in these directions :—

It is an *attempt* to fall back on original Christianity as set forth in the Apostolic documents. This type we find far more credible than the form which traditional Christianity has assumed in later ages. Take, as one example, the doctrine of *the nature of God*. The *Creed of St. Athanasius*—(falsely so-called, for he lived in the earlier part of the fourth century ; but this “Creed” is not found in Greek at all, and not even in Latin, as Canon Swainson has proved, till the eighth century)—this Creed insists on the use of phrases concerning the Divine Nature such as *Trinity* and *Three Persons in One God*, which are found nowhere in the New Testament. It speaks of the Son and Spirit as “equal to the Father.” The New Testament speaks of the Father as specially God : “One God the Father,” and “one Lord Jesus Christ.” And we prefer the New Testament language, and no one is rebuked for adhering to it. For myself, having been a preacher for forty-seven years, I have never once used the phrases, *Trinity*, or *Three Persons in One God*, in my public addresses and prayers, simply because they are not apostolic ; and no one has ever reprimanded me for the omission.

There is no doubt that the seven or eight thousand Independent and Baptist Churches, and the far larger number in America, firmly maintain that the language of Christ and His Inspired Apostles signifies that in His Person there was some awful and sublime mystery of Incarnation, as it is termed, some unique union of a Divine Nature with the Human Life, which constituted Christ's personality as an unexampled combination of the *finite* with the *Infinite*, and they hold that it was this union which lifts Him up into the dignity of Son of God, makes Him the object of faith and worship, and gives Him power to bestow eternal life on His followers. We firmly believe that Jesus was the Christ, or Messiah, or King, promised to the Jewish people and to mankind from early times, and that He is the “Saviour of the world,” through whom the Infinite and Eternal Love deals in gentleness and mercy with sinful men, pardons us, and opens to us the prospect of admission into that great and everlasting union of worlds, which Astronomy now dimly unveils to our apprehensions ; so that Christianity is closely connected with all the greatest thoughts and aspirations possible to humanity.

I give this only as an example. We hold the general principle that Christians ought to strive by study and honest criticism to get back to *Original Christianity* in thought and spirit—and, even when we make mistakes, we sympathize with each other in this endeavour ; for our one-sided mistakes are often “right creeds in the making.”

I might mention another example in relation to the question of the FUTURE LIFE. We agree that the ultimate truth concerning man's future can be learned only from our Maker ; and if God has spoken to us in the Christian religion it is there we must hear His words. The old mediæval faith of all Christian sects was, that man has been born immortal in sin, and inherits by descent the curse of immortality in sin and sorrow. From this men were to be saved by the Son of God, through renewal by the Spirit of God. It was held by the Calvinists that the finally saved were chosen to glory from all eternity. The *unsaved* were either "passed over," and left to their doom, or were even directly predestined to suffer in immortal misery.

There has been a deep and general revolt among us against this frightful result of false metaphysics and false criticism ; and now, at least the majority of the Independents would agree that the true doctrine on destiny cannot be one which shocks all our primary notions on Divine Justice, to say nothing of Mercy. The beginning of human life in every case being in feeblest infancy, it cannot possibly be true that a dear little child exists now in a state of reprobation ; or, if it depart, will go even into the "mildest hell" that St. Augustine could imagine. No ; there is a great change here. The belief in just and awful retribution for the wilful wasters of life, for wilful depravity of soul, for foul crimes against our fellow-creatures, for open defiance of God and of right—this belief in just retribution for distinct wickedness in thought, in government, in administration, in a punishment for wicked war-makers, oppressors of the poor, or robbers of the rich : this faith is stronger than ever, because the faith in Divine justice and *mercy* is stronger still.

Thus we value Independency, because it distinctly discourages dependence on the authority of priests and Churches—on human standards of faith—in order that the mind may be free to order its belief and practice by the standards of Original Christianity.

Then, again, we value Independency from its habit of drawing a sharp line between the function of the State with its *law*, and of the Church with its *Gospel* ; and for the steady war it maintains against the union of the two.

The State is the organization of Justice ; the Church is the organization of Grace. Any attempt to unite the two must work confusion in proportion to the completeness of the union, by adulterating the spirit and defeating the purposes of both. The State is a beneficent institution for the assertion and protection by law of all rights—of life, family, property, and reputation ; and these rights are defended by force and vindicated by penalties on offenders. Thus the magistrate is to be a "terror to evil-doers," as the Christian Apostle himself boldly says. If the magistrate, under the guidance of a spurious humanitarianism or a perverted Christianity, fails in his duty to the evil-doer, he himself deserves the punishment which he failed to inflict. The Church is founded on the idea of

pardon, forgiveness, forbearance ; and is a special society of believers, who thereby become brothers, who voluntarily bind themselves to forgive and overcome evil with good. They are organized for good works of mercy, for truth-spreading, for saving evil doers, for teaching the young, for helping the poor, for practising Christian morality ; finally, for maintaining these ends by a "discipline" which excludes obstinately hostile elements.

It is impossible to conceive of two societies more profoundly differing in their principles, ambitions, methods, and aims, when each is confined to its proper function, than the State and the Church. If you strive to unite them, what you call to establish the Church, you frustrate the ends of both. You soften the action of the State till it ceases to fight as it ought to do against injustice and violent wrong-doing, by both rich and poor ; and you harden and secularize the Church, and convert it into a pale shadow of the State, pious in aspect, but worldly and too often uninspired within.

The Independents have always upheld this distinction, and their ideas have made way. Disestablishment is a long process ; it has passed through several stages already, the last is approaching ; and when the Church of England is disestablished, we hope that instead of holding out (under lay or clerical fanatics) for unalterable adhesion to old methods, there will be made a strong endeavour towards local union with all good Christians—with Christian people in every locality—after the model of Primitive Christianity.

Lastly, we stand for Local Church Government as of the essence of permanent freedom, and the best provision for needful reforms.

It is the belief of the Independents that Church fellowship in every place ought to be broad enough to include all practical and consistent Christians, and narrow enough to exclude all who, whether in theory or practice, offer violence to essential Christianity. In the Apostolic Churches there were many mistaken notions held by half-instructed converts to Christ ; but the remedy was found, not in ready excommunication, but in greater zeal on the part of those who held the doctrine of the Apostles. Morally bad men were expelled from the society, until they repented, as we see in St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians ; but persons who erred on the question of the Resurrection were reprov'd, and instructed in the truth ; but not until they had renounced their error were subjected to discipline. A large local society receiving all practical disciples of Christ, and not limiting its numbers by the size of any building, is the surest guarantee for good fellowship, for practical good works, and for effective reforms. A local Church might use several buildings, without sacrificing its unity. In the prospect of local and catholic union we find the only prospect of Christian reconstruction—a great society, not dominated by distant sanhedrims, nor ruled by the traditions of a slavish and interested hierarchy, but permeated by all the currents of the best thought and the best purposes of Christian civilization. The people who live in puny gangs of sympathizers seldom

have any sympathy to spare for those whom they regard as outsiders and heretics.

I believe that these statements, as far as they go, convey a true idea of the genius of Independency, but in some respects an imperfect one, since the missionary spirit is one grand characteristic of those Churches, which there is now no space to describe or consider.

THE PLACE OF BAPTISTS IN THE EVOLUTION OF BRITISH CHRISTIANITY.

By JOHN CLIFFORD, M.A., D.D.

I.

ROTH calls attention to the ominous circumstance that "the idea of the kingdom of God, which occupies so prominent a position amongst the ideas of Christ, falls into the background in the minds of the Apostles." The fact is as undeniable as it is grave. For one reference to the "kingdom of righteousness, and peace, and joy" in the letters of the New Testament, there are at least a dozen in the reported sayings of the Master. In some of the epistles, you are rarely out of hearing of the clanking and grinding of ecclesiastical or controversial machinery, whereas in the gospels, the kingdom comes without observation; its movements are quiet as the healing and life-giving light, gentle and noiseless as the growth of flowers and fruit. The Apostles are so engrossed with the pressing needs of the new societies they have founded, and so absorbed by the difficulties of working the new organizations they have set going, that although they never lose sight of their King or of His kingdom, yet they suffer the brilliant conception of the Divine rule of justice, mercy, sweet forgivingness, and brotherly love to pale its splendours before the mean moralities and mordant controversies of their first converts. Even Paul, who always construes history and life through his belief in Christ, and never through any Church theory or dogmatic system, does not escape these necessities; so difficult is it in our world for even capable and heroic men "to keep the heights the soul is competent to gain."

(2) That was the fateful beginning of a long and disastrous decline from the ideal of Jesus. The history of Christianity, British and universal, is, through many a long chapter, the story of the contest for primacy between the idea of Christ as to the "Kingdom of God," and the ideas of men as to the Churches. The climate in which Christianity was born was so uncongenial that, to use the imagery of Renan, as the "new-born child emerged from its swaddling clothes, a most dangerous sort of croup threatened to choke it." The air was laden with the miasma of ritualism, and the vision of men soon became dim to the essential simplicity and dominant spirituality of the teaching of Christ. Priestism, that has never touched anything without corrupting it, thrust itself into the simple societies of disciples, and forthwith battles began concerning sacred orders and lordly hierarchies, theological systems and speculative opinions. Next came the tyranny of the intellect over the whole life in the form of

Gnosticism; and men ceased to think deeply and practically about a rule of God, *i.e.*, a rule of real goodness and purity, of sweet reasonableness and tender compassion, of sustained righteousness and conquering obedience to the law of the eternal. Machinery was all in all, and love, and justice, and the service of humanity slipped more and more out of sight.

(3) But a hopeful change is, and has been for a long period, in progress. A true philosophy of history is coming into vogue, which definitely follows the method of Christ and gives primary rank to the kingdom, and only a secondary and subordinate one to the priests and controversialists, the sectaries and dogmatists. We are being carried slowly but surely back to the Gospel, and to the "Gospel of the kingdom," *i.e.*, to Christ's way of looking at life, and thought, and progress, seeing them as they lie in His mind and according to His ideal. For history is essentially humanistic and by no means ecclesiastical, cares little for doctrinal disquisitions and much for practical ideas and creative principles, ignores the fight for words and forms, and gives distinction to aims and ideals. It winnows the chaff from the wheat, the sense from the soul, the form from the reality, the high-sounding claims from the positive victories over sin and crime, disease and death. It is never sectarian, but always broad and deep as the purest love. It is not Baptist or Anglican, but human, and its insistent question is, "*What do ye more than others?*"—not what are your claims, your "articles," your "orders;" but what is your contribution to the actual needs of men, your ministry to the poor and weak, your impact and inspiration to unselfish service. This is the law of the final judgment, and it is sheer waste of time and power to care one straw about any other.

(4) Nor need the weakest who is true, and the most despised who is sincere, fear that judgment. A true philosophy of history is not unrighteous to forget any work that has in the slightest degree met the felt needs of man as he is in himself and in his relations to his fellows. History despises none of her intellectual or ethical forces, whether Catholic or Culturist, Anglican or Quaker, Comprehensionist or Separatist; but rejoices without stint in the gift of all the sons of men, and assures us it would be as wise to ignore the tiny creatures that build up the coral islands of the southern seas as to pass by any one of these contributions to the spiritual fulness and wealth of the world.¹ Therefore, the life and work of Baptists is a valuable part of British Christianity, only so far as it has become one of the successive steps in which the human spirit has been forced onward by the immanent logic of the religious life in its organic development. Service to humanity in its higher ranges of life and work is the supreme test of the worth of Churches. No society can escape that judgment, nor can the most prosperous and popular community finally confuse it. Each Church must be made manifest according to its utterance of the "word,"

¹ Cf. Dean Stanley in *Church and Chapel*, edited by R. H. Hadden, pp. xxxv, xxxv

and offering of the service by which men and nations really live and securely advance towards their true ethical and spiritual goal.

II

It is of the first importance to keep in view this cardinal law, as we attempt to fix the place of Baptists in the development of our British Christianity ; for it is notorious that Baptists have an extremely poor and inconspicuous place in the grand succession of majestic heirarchies and colossal system-builders that marches along the centuries. Baptists have done nothing for the methods and machinery of Christianity, unless it is that they have shown how immeasurably inferior methods and machinery are to intrinsic conviction, personal faith, and passionate devotion to high ideals. No elaborate organization bears our name. No towering ecclesiastical edifice has been built by our hands. No ornate and splendid ritual has come forth from our mint. No service, rich in its harmonies, prolific in mystic suggestion and entrancing and calming at once with blended song and prayer belongs to us. We cannot even claim to have created one homogeneous Baptist Church with graded officers, binding ceremonies, authoritative creed, and high pontifical dignitaries. Few great organizing personalities have appeared amongst us ; and those who have risen have had to confront tremendous difficulties in their building work. An Ignatius Loyola, vast as was his innate power of attracting and commanding men, could not have thriven on Baptist fare. The wonderful genius of the founder of Methodism could never have reared his beneficent structure on our principles. Indeed, we are not, and cannot become, a mere ecclesiastical corporation without disloyalty to the creative ideas and living convictions which gave us birth.

Of course we are not entirely without machinery, and in recent years a marked increase has slowly, and in the face of much suspicion, taken place. We have created a union for the churches of Great Britain and Ireland, in addition to the existing associations for counties, societies for missions, and for the education of preachers and various funds for helping the weak and needy. Our foreign missionary organizations have become colossal, widespread and reproductive. But our social unit is still held in its integrity to be that which was settled by the men of the seventeenth century, viz., a society of believers in Christ ; a society self-contained, rigidly self-governed, and strenuously independent. In a certain characteristic way, we have assented to the saying of the philosopher Lotze that "mechanism is everywhere essential, but everywhere subordinate ;" but whilst the latter clause is affirmed with energy, the former is met with the inbred scepticism that watches the machinery with nervous dread lest we should be caught in its revolving wheels and lose our free and joyous life. Knowing how often organizations have become the iron sceptre of the theological or ecclesiastical despot, the Baptist has elected to diminish his immediate

social efficiency, rather than risk his freedom to act according to his own conscience.

(2) Therefore the place of Baptists in British Christianity is not to be looked for amongst its compact synods and priestly assemblies, but in the neighbourhood of the humble and ignoble few who, single-handed or in small companies, have striven to increase the vitality of the intellectual and spiritual contents of Christianity by *glowing enthusiasm for ideas*. They belong to the men who, in the judgment of their practical contemporaries have been the vulgar and deluded victims of far-shining illusions, vacuous dreamers of impossible utopias, pinched fanatics who have disdained the bread of this world and nourished their faith and fortitude on airy and unsubstantial visions of God and duty. Ideas have made them, shaped their movements, fed their heroism in martyr flames, and inspired their quenchless zeal. Even the wild and frantic struggles of the Anabaptists of Holland were sustained by the notions—that, if God had a kingdom at all, it should be here on this earth, a boon to suffering men; that, His inspirations could not be partial, exclusive, limited to castes and orders, but must be free for all souls that sincerely sought Him; and when the General Baptists started into life in the first and second decades of the seventeenth century, it was under the magnetic spell of the doctrines of “Liberty of Conscience,” “Freedom to worship God,” “Salvation for everybody,” the sovereignty of the soul in religion, and the absolute and unquestioned monarchy of Christ over the conscience and over all life.

“O Truth! O Freedom! how are ye still born
In the rude stable, in the manger nursed;
What humble hands unbar those gates of morn,
Through which the splendours of the new day burst?”

(3) Is it not then one of the ghastly ironies of history that after three centuries of existence the one idea of the Baptists that has chief currency amongst outsiders is, that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries they were simple enough to give vitality on British soil to the ancient practice of immersion as the right mode of baptism—a symbol, it is commonly alleged by opponents, that in its Oriental home may have been appropriate and useful enough; but in the frigid North, and amongst reasoning Westerns, can never appear other than a “demoralizing fetichism”? Is it not strange that the popular label of one of the most anti-ritualistic and spiritual of societies should fix attention on a method and not on a conviction, on a form and not on an idea? It is a sad fate, and we must bear it as cheerfully as we can.¹ “Baptism by *immersion*,” says the Rev. Brooke Lambert, Vicar of Greenwich, “is strictly no peculiarity of the Baptist sect. The rubrics of our Church (*i.e.*, the Episcopal Church) make baptism by immersion the rule. It prescribes baptism by immersion, ‘if they shall

¹ In an appendix on the different denominations in *Church and Chapel*, there are seven grave mistakes within the space of the first thirteen lines treating of the Baptists, pp. 99, 100.

certify that the child may well endure it, but if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it.' The exception has by custom become the rule."¹ Moreover, it is a needless and careless misrepresentation to assign the *motif* of Baptist existence to a rite in any sense whatever; for as a matter of historic fact they do not take their place in the annals of British Christianity from special interest in the form of a ceremony as such, but from those great formative ideas which are the impelling powers of our modern life,—ideas concerning the human soul and intrinsic religion; the human soul and personal liberty; the human soul and the province of the state.²

III.

In order to verify that assertion let us glance for a moment at the wonderful "revolt" of individualism against authority in Church and State, which fills so large a space in the annals of our race under the name of the "new birth or *Renaissance*." "Revolutions," it has been said, "raise questions." The Renaissance was, in this respect, singularly prolific, and not even yet are the authentic answers to those questions fully to hand. It was, in its larger and later issues, the awakening and regeneration of the intellect of Europe by the resurrection of the forgotten literature of the ancient world,—a resurrection disclosing a richer civilization, a clearer thought, a finer style, and a truer life; and becoming a mirror in which the men of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries saw themselves; a standard by which they judged their conduct and achievements, and a starting-point from which they went forward to secure the spiritual and political renewal of the world.

That recovered literature was Christian as well as classical, and carried men back to Jerusalem and Christ as well as to Athens and Socrates, so that the men who shrunk self-condemned, when they compared their corrupt life with classical attainment, could not withhold their censures from the professors and organizations of Christianity when they found their prodigious departure from the original purpose and plan of the Founder of the Christian religion. Indeed they asked, "Was it Christ's Church at all?" Did it breathe His Spirit? Was it doing His work? Ought they not to go back to Apostolic training as the only way of realizing at once the idea of Christ, the deliverance of Europe from death, and the fuller education of the human race?

At that time there was no question of equal gravity. It was the "blazing" subject of the hour. No topic required so much daring in those who handled it; so much steadfast heroism in those who were prepared to follow their answer to its legitimate issues. It was a new question, and it was as revolutionary as it was new. Merely to put it suggested to many minds the

¹ *Church and Chapel*, edited by R. H. Hadden, p. 3.

² Cf. Lazarus, *Flint's Philosophy of History*, p. 583.

profanest hardihood, and lifted whirlwinds of scorn. Ineffably worse was it then, to ask, "Is the State Church the new Testament Church?" "Ought all parishioners to be Church members?" than it is to ask to-day, "Is there a God?" "Is the Bible true?" "Is Christianity historically verifiable?" and the men who put the inquiry had to be ready for banishment to the wilds of America, or the more genial refuge of Holland, or even for martyrdom, if the response they found carried them into opposition to the reigning notions of the hour, and to the State-supported and State-defended religious institutions of the day.

Do not let us disguise this fact. Whatever English Baptists may be and do *now*, it is certain their ORIGIN is *not* due to the quiet investigation of two or three passages of Scripture concerning the way in which believers in Christ should be baptized; whether by sprinkling, by pouring, or by dipping; whether once or three times; nor to the rejection of Infant baptism; nor even to the denial of the magical sacramental efficacy of baptism; it goes far deeper, and includes immeasurably more. The Baptist Church sprang into being, as other Churches did in that day—not from wild fanaticism; not from excessive vanity; not from questions of much or little water in a rite, but from unswerving loyalty to God; from a profoundly religious effort to form a *visible Christian Church after the idea and according to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself*. It was a real human struggle for the realization of Divine ideas, born out of the love of God and the desire for the establishment of His reign upon earth. Baptist history is therefore a bush aflame with the presence of God, and the ground it covers is not less holy than that on which Moses, with bared feet, stood hopeful, yet trembling, as near to the God of Israel.

(2) The story of the origin of the British Baptists is then a fragment of the larger story, first of the Renaissance, and next of what we call the Protestant Reformation; and takes rank by the side of those thrilling chapters of our annals which narrate the work of John Wycliffe and his preachers, of the humanist Erasmus and Dean Colet, the separation of England from Rome, the appearance and mission of the Puritans, the rise and progress of the Separatists and Brownists, Independents and Quakers. Erasmus, the most brilliant representative of the humanistic culture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, had issued, in 1502, his *Enchiridion militis Christiani*, "to counteract the errors of those who place piety in ceremonies and external observances, but neglect its very essence." To that he had added, in 1516, the Greek New Testament, through which men heard the Master Himself speaking as in the first days. By these and other publications, by lectures and letters, this unrivalled scholar and teacher was aiding in formulating the answer of the intellect and conscience to the question of the age, concerning Christ and the Church, in terms which excluded at once the Pope and the Papacy, sacerdotalism and ceremonialism, and all un-reality.

Then came amongst us William Tyndall, fanning into a flame the

smouldering embers of Lollardism, rousing into new and fuller life the recipients of the message of Wycliffe, by sending forth the New Testament in an English version, which in substance is still in use amongst us. It only needed that the capacious, passionate, and irresistible soul of Luther should be set on fire and peal forth with its new energy through Europe like thunder echoing amongst Alpine hills, and Protestantism leaped forth, armed and weaponed for war from which it can only cease when its work for man is fully accomplished.

(3) But the answers to the questions of the ages come slowly, and at the cost of much struggle, suffering, and blood. British Protestantism was at first a very sickly child. Royal, ecclesiastic, and theological nurses were so timorous of change, and so reluctant to part with the proved follies of the past, that they went far to destroy it. Therefore it was not long before there grew by the side of it, if not actually from it, a *second* Protestantism, with a sharper accent, a more decided ring, carrying the revolt against the paganized Christianity of the Papacy to a further extreme. The *first* protest was mainly against the *Pope* of Rome and his jurisdiction in these realms. The *second* protest was an endorsement of the first, but it went beyond it, and protested with even a stronger vehemence against copes, stoles, and altars, and the priestly dogmas, practices, and paraphernalia of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Protestantism had inevitably protested itself into Puritanism. It must be so. Protestantism was essentially and centrally part of a return to the *Divine Original* of Christian faith and practice in the Scriptures; and once on that road, Protestantism could not be a finality. PURITANISM was the logical issue of the Protestant spirit, a clearer and more adequate solution of the problem of the hour. As Carlyle says, it was "one of the noblest heroisms ever transacted on this earth," and owed its rise to the direct appeal to the recovered literature of Paul and Peter; and its surprising energy and rapid progress were also due to the tremendous impulse given to the religious life of the nation, about the middle of Elizabeth's reign, by the circulation of those same Scriptures. The Bible became the chief literature of England; its fable and its history, its poetry and its philosophy, its manual of practice, and its guide and inspiration to devotion—so that Grotius said of this country, ten years after the Queen's death, "Theology rules there;" and Professor Green affirms that "the whole nation had become, in fact, a Church."¹

(4) Is that the last answer to the question of the age? Has Puritanism, with its deep inwardness, strong idealism, and severe discipline, reached finality? No! "the coming life-cry is always on;" the humanistic, biblical and spiritual forces at work in the English nation, revolutionizing its religious ideas and practices, could not stop there. As the first protest led on to the second, so the second led on a *third*.

Puritanism advanced to SEPARATISM. Bodies of men appeared who

¹ *History of the English People*, 449.

were unwilling to admit that the Church of England, even if reformed according to the Genevan pattern, was a true Church of Christ. A deeper Reformation was requisite than a change of dress and of ritual. *The terms of membership required alteration.* "It is contrary," said the Separatists, "to the will of Christ that the area of the Church should be fixed by the area of the land. We are profoundly convinced that the practical reform of the spiritual life of England can never be realized in connection with that parochial system of churches which considers all baptised persons to be redeemed children of God, until excommunication has furnished proof to the contrary." Thus a *third* form of Protestantism arose, more advanced than the second, and inculcating the necessity of forming "particular churches." Led by Robert Browne (an "erratic individual," according to Fuller and Masson), Henry Barrowe, Francis Johnson, John Penry, John Greenwood, and Henry Jacob, such separated churches grew exceedingly, and, according to Green, numbered 20,000 souls in the middle of Elizabeth's reign. Some of these churches were called Brownists, after Robert Browne, and subsequently Independents, from their assertion of the sufficiency of the Church to care for and govern itself, and their death-defying insistence upon the principle that the Church of Christ ought not to, and could not, consist of any but those who were really believers in Him, and avowedly subject to His authority. They vehemently opposed the pernicious doctrine of sponsorship,² and would not accept the theory of Whitgift and Hooker, that the nation makes the Church, and that being born in a parish of the nation gives a right to be in the Church of Christ. Strongly, and even fiercely, they denounced the deed by which "in one day, with the blast of Queen Elizabeth's trumpet," ignorant papist and gross idolaters were made faithful Christians and true professors.³ The unit of the Church of Christ is, and always must be, a Christian man.

(5) Now out of these Separatists, with their cardinal principle that the members of a New Testament Church should be Christians, grew logically and inevitably the ENGLISH BAPTISTS. The *first* protest was against Romanism as concentrated in a pope, and subjecting the king of this land to his authority; the *second* protest was against all papal practices, and in favour of getting rid of a prelacy and bringing in synodical authority; the *third* protest was against the inclusion of all the subjects of the king in the Church, irrespective of their spiritual character, and in favour, ultimately, of the self-governing powers of each separate Christian society; but still, INFANTS were included, at least the infants of Christian parents, and yet how could they be personally conscious Christians? how could they aid in the government of a Church? What spiritual character had they to qualify them for membership? It was certain as to-morrow that a *FOURTH* PROTEST should come. The forces of the living word, and of their own

¹ Green, *History of the English People*, 459.

² Dr. H. L. Dexter, *Congregationalism as seen in its Literature*, 77.

³ Henry Barrowe's *Brief Description of the False Church* (1590), p. 10.

faith impelled them to oppose the inclusion of any persons in the Church of Christ Jesus, excepting such as intelligently and consciously received Him, and were possessed of His Divine life. THAT FOURTH PROTEST WAS MADE BY THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS, AND IS THEIR HISTORICAL ROOT. To cite the language of one of these, they reasoned thus: "The Separation must either go back to England (*i.e.* the English Church), or forward to true Baptism; all that shall in time to come separate from England must separate from the Baptism of England; and if they will not separate from the Baptism of England, there is no reason why they should separate from England as from a false Church." Right as far as they went, yet the Separatists and Independents did not go far enough to satisfy these root and branch men. They had got firm grip of a principle, and they were willing to go with it wherever it might take them. They were contending for eternal realities. The battle was not about words, but spiritual facts. Christ Jesus was central to His Church, and a living personal and conscious relation to Him was the fundamental condition of fellowship in His societies. Personal faith in, and personal subjection to, the Lord Jesus, is all and in all. But faith is a conscious act. It requires intelligence. It involves will. It is not possible to a babe; therefore babes have no more right in the Church of the New Testament because they are born in a Christian family than Englishmen have perforce a right in the Church because they are born in a Christian parish. The principle which excludes the parishioner allows no place to the babe. So they reasoned, so they felt and acted, and thus English Baptists came into being as a vital and enduring product of the great Protestant Reformation, and in fact advancing that reform a stage further than it had before marched, but along its own original lines of the pre-eminence of the Scriptures, and the absolute necessity of a really personal godliness. It was a logical and conclusive application of the governing rules and controlling spirit of Puritanism, carrying if we may mathematically express it, Protestantism up to its fifth power, as a denial of the right of men to substitute any merely external conditions and accidental circumstances, for a living, sincere, and real faith in Christ, and a hearty personal subjection to His august authority.

This, then, is demonstrated. Baptists are the last response but one given to the question of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, What is religion in its essence and spirit? that last answer being supplied by the "Friends" or Quakers who have abolished all ordinances and insisted on the exclusively spiritual nature of all religion and all worship. The genealogical tree of the British Christianity of those centuries may be labelled, so far as our present inquiry extends, Humanist in root, Protestant in bole; then the first branch is Puritan, the second Separatist, the third Independent, the fourth Baptist. Thus history energetically repudiates the dominant notion that the Baptist became a Baptist because he made much of baptism. It was the reverse; it was because he made *little* of it, and

fixed the supreme emphasis on the inward and ethical qualification for the rite. It is not he, but the Romanist who makes much of the act when he says in the language of the Council of Trent: "Whoever shall affirm that baptism is indifferent—*i.e.* not necessary to salvation—let him be accursed."¹ It is not he, but the Anglican, who makes much of baptism, when he declares that that prophet-statesman of our age, John Bright, could not be a Christian because "he had not been made one by the Sacrament of Baptism, and to treat an unbaptized man as one who has been baptized is to regard that Sacrament as a sham." It is not he, but the Prayer-Book, which says that baptism makes anybody "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." The Baptist comes to his place in British Christianity in a great and sustained struggle for reality, sincerity, soul; for ridding religion of all sham and pretence, by insisting on personal faith, personal love, and mercy and justice, on pure aims and high ideals.

IV.

It is part of the irresistible logic of the spiritual life that those who have been so resolute in the assertion of the inwardness of religion, the inviolable sacredness of the human unit, and the unfettered sovereignty of the soul, should also contend for that soul's perfect freedom from all external authority, whether of creeds or churches, synods or states. The few Baptists who had taken their place in the "extreme left," and formed the beginning of the "Radical" wing of the Protestant host, were therefore in the likeliest position to catch first sight of the new conception of intellectual and religious liberty, swimming into the clearing heavens of the dawning century like a new planet through the stellar spaces.

It is the unequivocal testimony of historians, that Britain owes to Baptists what has been called "the noblest innovation of modern times," the idea of intellectual and spiritual freedom. I do not forget the great scholar Abelard, who was one of the earliest to maintain the principle of individualism against the authority of the Church, nor his famous pupil Arnold of Brescia, who in the twelfth century applied the principle of free inquiry to the claims of popes and bishops to exercise power as *secular princes*; nor the potent sway of those poet-humanists—Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio; but that able and fair-minded student, Dr. Gardiner, says in his recently published *History of the Great Civil War*:—

"Exposed as they were to contempt and persecution, the Baptists early rallied to the doctrine of a complete separation between Church and State. In 1612 or 1613, an English Baptist Congregation at Amsterdam declared its belief that *"the magistrate is not to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and conscience."* This idea

¹ Canon 5. Cf. also Canon 13.

firmlly took root amongst the Baptists, and found expression from time to time in petitions and pamphlets, which were far more thorough in their claim that liberty of conscience was the right of all men than those put forward by the ordinary Separatists."¹

Professor Masson, in his *Life of Milton*, says, referring to the above, this is "the first expression of the absolute principle of liberty of conscience in the public articles of any body of Christians." Thomas Helwise, who had the chief hand in drawing up this document, was John Smyth's successor, and he drew around him some unforgettable men. Leonard Busher, who published the first English tract on "Liberty of Conscience," in 1614, was one of his flock; and John Morton, who sent out a tractate entitled, "Objections Answered by Way of Dialogue, wherein is proved by the Law of God, by the Law of our Land, and by His Majesty's Many Testimonies, that no man ought to be Persecuted for his Religion, so he Testify his Allegiance by the Oath appointed by Law," was his assistant.

Thus, as Professor Masson says, "from a dingy meeting-house, some where in Old London, there flashed out first in England the absolute doctrine of Religious Liberty." And more decisively he says, "Not to the Church of England, however, nor to Scottish Presbyterianism, nor to English Puritanism at large, does the honour of the first perception of the full principle of liberty of conscience, and its first assertion in English speech, belong. That honour has to be assigned, I believe, to the Independents generally, and to the Baptists in particular." There is no doubt, then, that the General Baptists may, in the face of the present evidence, keep their forward rank as the first promulgators of the absolute doctrine of religious liberty.²

(2) But to assess that service at its exact value, we must recall the ruling ideas and forces of parliaments and churches in 1612. Vast and far-reaching as were the changes introduced by the Renaissance and the Reformation, there was not a Protestant Church in Europe that had nobleness and love enough to find room for the principle of religious liberty, or even of toleration of differences in religious belief and practice. Man most reluctantly parts with his right as a brute to persecute so long as he can. Somehow he will play the tyrant to the full length of his power, and if in the mutations of the ages he grows ashamed of the rack and thumbscrew, and the prison and the fire, he is surprisingly inventive, and deftly prepares numberless disguises for carrying out his inquisitorial tyranny. Even yet we have little more than full liberty to be religious after the fashion of the hour, and in accordance with the wish or whim of the majority. Dissent

¹ Dr. S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, 1642-44, 336, 337.

² "It is not only unmerciful, but unnatural and abominable; yea monstrous for one Christian to vex and destroy another for difference and questions of religion." "Busher's Religious Peace; or, a Plea for liberty of Conscience." Reprinted in Dr. Underhill's Tracts on "Liberty of Conscience, etc.," 1846, p. 24.

is still costly, and if you venture towards the dissidence of dissent, and the thorough-going practice of freedom in judgment and faith, you may expect to be assiduously pursued with unrelenting bitterness and unscrupulous hostility.

But in 1600 persecution rioted in all its brutal ferocity. Germany and Switzerland, England and Scotland inflicted civil disabilities on those who did not conform to the State-established Church. The Inquisition was victorious in Spain; the League in France worked for the extirpation of unbelievers. In England heresy was an offence punishable by death for 135 years after the Reformation, and it was not till 1677 that an act was passed abolishing the writ for burning heretics. Nor were the churches more enlightened. Even those who flung off the shackles of ecclesiastical bondage for themselves were busy forging fetters for others. The changes in religion were at first mainly changes in tyrants; a substitution for the infallibility they opposed of another not less self-willed, intrusive and persecuting; the removal of a pope and his cardinals to give room for a king and his clergy. They did not battle for liberty as liberty, but only for that liberty that enabled them to hold and teach what they pleased, and to repress and punish all who dared to dissent. Presbyterians shared the Romanist intolerance, and fought for a domination not less exacting so that they might get rid of those pestiferous people, the Papists and Baptists, the Quakers and Socinians. Milton read and interpreted aright the signs of the times when he said that "new presbyter was but old priest writ large." Calvin, a man intrinsically noble, building his theological system first, and interpreting his Bible afterwards, misses the Divine revelation of liberty, and shares the blind intolerance of the theologians and Christians of his day. Prynne embodies the idea and feeling of his time when he teaches that parliament is the creator of churches, and that a man is to be scorned who does not "make it a point of conscience and of Christianity to submit" to its authority.¹ Indeed, excepting the Reformer Castalio, there was hardly a public teacher who did not maintain that orthodoxy conferred an absolute right to kill the body of the unfortunate wight who was bold or foolish enough to question its infallible affirmations. Therefore, to discover in such darkness the sublime doctrine of spiritual liberty, and to promulgate it from the "little dingy meeting-house in old London," was to render a service to British Christianity and to the progress of man, not less opulent in noble and beneficent issues than the discovery of America by Columbus, or the invention of printing by Gutenberg,—it was to build a Pharos for all distressed ecclesiastical and theological mariners; it was to give an impulse to the total development of men by turning the stream of fresh and living thought on all the stock ideas of the world; it was to promote the inwardness of culture by the gift of a fitting atmosphere, and to add to the fulness and variety and energy of the intellectual and ethical life of mankind.

¹ Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, ii. 3.

But Mazzini reminds us that not only does every great revolution demand a great idea to be its centre of action, to furnish it both lever and fulcrum for the work it has to do; but "incarnation in action" is also and equally necessary,¹ or else the incorruptible Word will not fructify in a large and nourishing harvest. Such incarnations were appearing and increasing in the Baptists and Independents of the time. John Smyth, the founder of the "General Baptists" in 1608-11, was first a clergyman of the Anglican Church, next a Separatist, then an Independent, and lastly an Arminian Baptist. A brave soul, of noble make and of incorruptible sincerity, "broad as the charity of Almighty God, narrow as His righteousness," he was ready to follow truth wherever and to whatever of loss and suffering she might lead; and for him a joyous acceptance of that leadership meant life as an exile for conscience sake in Holland, where, breathing an atmosphere impregnated with the theological teaching of James Arminius, and the doctrine of toleration taught by the celebrated Dutch lawyer and statesman Grotius, he learnt in pain the truth that Helwise and Busher and their friends were to teach. Another Episcopalian, Roger Williams, infected with the "dingy meeting-house" doctrines, embarked for America in 1630, there founded the first Baptist Church in 1639, and was the first legislator who provided for free and absolute liberty of conscience. Dr. Gardiner, speaking of another hero of freedom, John Milton, says "his love of liberty was a high intellectual persuasion, not like that of Roger Williams, which sprang from Biblical study undertaken under stress of persecution."² Hugh Peters succeeded Roger Williams as pastor of the church in Rhode Island, but coming back to this country in the time of civil war he became an army chaplain. He was a man entirely after the heart of that great Independent and stern warrior for liberty, Oliver Cromwell. He loved freedom "from the kindness of a man of genial temper to whom a minute theological study was repulsive, and who, without disguising his own opinions, preferred goodness of heart to rigidity of doctrine." "Truly it wounds my soul," he said, "when I think Ireland would perish, and England continue her misery through the disagreement of ten or twenty learned men. . . . Could we but conquer each other's spirit, we should soon befooled the devil and his instruments; to which end I could wish we that are ministers might pray together, eat and drink together, because, if I mistake not, estrangement hath boiled us up to jealousy and hatred."³ Those were heroes who, like William Sawtry, Sir James Bainham, Richard Woodman, Anne Askew, Joan Boucher, Benjamin Hewling, and Elizabeth Gaunt, could die and never yield, suffer but not flinch from their faithfulness; fight for ideas and impossibilities, but not dull the keen edge of their enthusiasm, or dim the brightness of their hope. They were possessed

¹ *Essays on Faith and the Future*, p. 24.

² Dr. Gardiner, *il.*, p. 301.

³ *Ibid.*

of that "intrinsic conviction" described by John Morley as "the mainstay of human advancement," and like Bunyan were ready to reply to the judge who threatened hanging if they continued preaching, "If I were out of prison to-day, I should preach to-morrow by the help of God." Consequences! they cared not a jot for those that reached themselves so long as they were true to their conscience and their King. Safety! they scorned the mean cowardice that put that before duty :—

"Bodies fall by wild sword-law ;
But who would force the soul, tilts with a straw
Against a champion cased in adamant." ¹

". . . Men they were who could not bend ;
Blest pilgrims, surely as they took for guide
A will by sovereign conscience sanctified ;
Blest while their spirits from the woods ascend
Along a galaxy that knows no end,
But in His glory who for sinners died." ²

V.

It is impossible for me to trace in all its fruitful issues this regal idea. "Liberty of Conscience" is not a phrase, but incarnate in men it is a force, and one of the most efficient in history. It springs from the value and possibilities of the individual man, and cannot cease in its creative and reforming work till it permeates all life—individual, political, social, and international—and fashions it in obedience to the great principle of soul-freedom. The men who, in the language of Froude, "assisted in their deaths to pay the purchase-money of England's freedom," did not foresee the range and elevation of their acquisitions. The total extinction of slavery of the body was in it ; for if the higher faculties of conscience and will are free, by what right do the chains still hold the limbs? Hence those who had entered into the heritage of the Quakers and Baptists and Independents could not rank behind the most chivalrous and devoted warriors on behalf of the abolition of slavery in Jamaica, and all the colonies, and at last in the United States. Political liberty was in it,— "one man one vote," aye, and "one woman one vote ;" the sovereignty of the soul means personal obligation to promote the welfare of the body politic in its widest interests and ramifications. Social emancipation and social happiness were in it. Did not that Baptist, Hugh Peters, foresee our day when he said he had ever sought after three things : "First, that goodness which is really so, and such religion might be highly advanced ; secondly, that good learning might have all countenance ; and thirdly, that there may not be a beggar in Israel—in England" ? Surely that last note in the army chaplain's legacy gives him high rank amongst the earliest British Christian socialists !

(a) You will not imagine that I forget for a moment that Baptists have

¹ *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, Wordsworth, Part III., No. 7, p. 63.

² *Ibid.*, No. 13, p. 67.

only been one regiment of the soldiers fighting for these victories. I merely keep to my text, but with a deep sense that the debt to our predecessors and allies is immeasurably great; and specially to those nearest us—the stalwart and aggressive Independents on the right and the quietly invincible Quakers on the left. All I have striven to show is that the place of Baptists in the evolution of British Christianity is:—

First, that of fearless warriors in the struggle for reality and personal responsibility in religion; and that to that struggle they owe their partial detachment from the religious organizations in the midst of which they were living.

Secondly, that of leaders in the conception and promulgation of the glad tidings of freedom from the interference and control of state and ecclesiastical authorities.

Thirdly, that of fellow-workers for the emancipation of the slave, the uplifting of the lower races, and the improvement of the social condition of mankind. I have said nothing of the contributions made to British Christianity by the theologian Andrew Fuller,¹ and by the re-creation of foreign missions by William Carey in the last century; nor yet of that superlative wealth of character in the host of nameless saints, members of Baptist churches, and heroic toilers for the redemption of men and the destruction of all evil.

“The healing of the world
Is in its nameless saints. Each separate star
Seems nothing, but a myriad scattered stars
Break up the night and make it beautiful.”

(3) Nor have I said anything about the future. I know little about it. It is affirmed that all ecclesiasticisms, chemically speaking, are in a state of decomposition, and I cannot deny it. Fortunately, “the loudest beating of the drum will not check the rising of the sun.” The energy of the Renaissance is not yet spent. The Reformation waits still for its completion. The simple ideas of the Christianity of Christ are full of revolutionary power, and need living application to the legislative, commercial, and social life of the world. In that work Baptists ought to have a large share, and the larger because our task, in so far as it relates to the exposition of New Testament baptism, is nearly done. Exegesis is wholly with us in teaching that baptism is not more and not less than an outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of loyalty to the Lord Jesus, a loyalty of which the recipient of baptism himself is really and dimly conscious. Priestism, apparently growing and nourished by the materialistic and æsthetic fashions of the hour, has lost for ever its basis on the Scriptures and the traditions of the Early Church. The return to the Christ of the Testament is delivering the Churches from the blinding doctrine of the magical efficacy of sacraments, and sapping the inward forces of sacer-

¹ *Contemporary Review*, vol. liii, p. 510.

dotalism. Baptists to-day are as loyal as ever to the supremacy of the spirit and to freedom of conscience; as emphatic as of old in proclaiming personal responsibility; more resolute in their repudiation of ritualism, word and thing; more emphatic in their recognition of spiritual and ethical affinities as the basis of Church fellowship; more eager than ever to have their windows open to all the daylight, to secure perfect religious equality, and to promote the true brotherhood and social well-being of men :—

“ Spirit of Freedom, on,
And pause not in thy flight,
Till every clime be won
To worship in thy light ! ”

THE QUAKER REFORMATION.

BY WILLIAM POLLARD

THE Founders of the Society of Friends, in the seventeenth century, were accustomed to say that the aim of the Reformation movement in which they were engaged was the Revival of Primitive Christianity. By this they did not mean a mere imitation of the practices and arrangements of the Early Christians, but a revival of that spirit of simple genuine unclerical religion that was so characteristic of the first century. They felt that the Christian Church had grievously lapsed from the pure and primitive faith. The great Central Truth of Christianity—the Real Presence of the Spirit of Christ in the hearts of His followers—had come to be almost ignored. The free spiritual Republic that Christ had instituted had been largely supplanted by the despotism and tyranny of a human priesthood. Externals had taken the place of spirituals. Forms had replaced realities. Observances had been substituted for duties. Elaborate metaphysical creeds had been gradually constructed and made the test of orthodoxy, because it was more in accord with priestly aim and worldly nature to profess faith in theological doctrines and outward ceremonies, than to seek after and obey the Spirit of Christ. Even the great upheaval of the Reformation in the sixteenth century had, as they believed, by no means removed these evil growths. Startling and wide-reaching as the Reforming movement had been, both in Germany and England, it was of necessity very imperfect. Even the Great Leaders of that movement were far from seeing all the beautiful simplicity and breadth of spiritual Truth, as it had been recognised in Primitive days. The times were ripe for another advance toward the simple practical Religion of Christ, and George Fox was manifestly called by God to lead in the work.

Fox has been fittingly called “the last of the Reformers.” His aim was to complete what the earlier Reformers began; what the Puritans had in some respects carried forward, but which still remained unfinished;—the Restoration of Primitive Christianity.

George Fox was born in 1624; so his youth was passed at a most eventful time in English History, when it seemed doubtful whether the Government would go on—as it had done for ages—gradually developing into a limited and constitutional monarchy, or would sink into a Despotism.

In his early boyhood there was for years no Parliament; there was no free speech. Heretics were remorselessly hunted in almost every parish

in the kingdom. Those were times to set men thinking; and no doubt they helped in no small degree to ripen and develop the character of young George Fox. We will glance briefly at his after life and teaching, that we may sketch in outline his view of what Primitive Christianity required.

Fox was a man of wonderful natural endowments; and though with no more scholastic instruction than the middle classes of his day enjoyed, yet he had a mind of no ordinary powers, cultivated too in a particular direction in a very remarkable manner. The knowledge of God, not as a mere intellectual speculation, but as a true solvent of that mystery, human life—the true Restorative that would harmonize and guide and give spiritual power—was the great object of his longing search from youth to manhood; and in this search his almost constant companion was the Bible.

But though the volume of inspiration was most precious to him, he could not be satisfied, or rest with it alone. He loved it, because it revealed the Divine Helper,—the Christ of God;—to whom he longed most intensely to come, that he might have spiritual Life, and might know both Truth and Duty. For this end he agonized for months in solitude,—he read,—he prayed,—he made earnest inquiries of men who were thought to have Christian experience: but still no light came. As Spurgeon says, “Fox was driven at last into the dreadful wilderness of self-despair, and made to see the dark chambers of imagery of his own natural heart.” And then, in God’s own time, the Revelation came. Fox’s own record of this momentous crisis in his life is deeply touching and instructive. He says,—“When all my hopes in men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could I tell what to do, then, oh! then, I heard a voice which said, ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition;’ and when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy. Then the Lord let me see why there was none else that could speak to my condition, viz., that I might give Him all the glory; that Christ might have the pre-eminence, who enlightens and gives Grace and Faith and Power.”

The Divine Comforter who thus revealed Himself spoke to a willing and longing heart; and from that time forth—though his discipline was by no means over, for he felt himself a disciple,—a learner, to the end of his days,—George Fox grew to have an apostolic faith in the real Presence of Christ.

This young man of nineteen became shortly so filled with his new life, that he says he could have wept day and night with tears of joy;—and he was soon called to proclaim his great discovery to others. Thus, with the heavenly anointing manifestly resting upon him, he entered upon his mission as a religious Reformer;—commissioned to bring back to the Church a long-lost and forgotten Truth. “I was commanded,” he says, “to turn people to that inward Light, Spirit and Grace, by which all might

know their salvation, and their way to God ; even that Divine Spirit which would lead them into all truth."

With persuasive eloquence Fox began now to call men from "forms and shadows," to the life, light, and power of Christ in their own hearts. Numerous converts speedily united with him in the great Reforming work, many of them as devoted as Fox ; and it is important to note that their primary ground of union—(as officially stated by the London Yearly Meeting)—was, "agreement of sentiment in regard to Christ's inward teaching."

George Fox formulates still more definitely the nature of His mission in the following words :—"By the power and Spirit of God, I was to bring people off from all their own ways, to Christ the new and Living Way : and from the churches which had been gathered in the wisdom of man, to the Church of God of which Christ is the Head. And off from the world's teachers made by men, to learn of Christ, of whom the Father said, '*This is My beloved Son. Hear Him.*' And off from the world's worship, to know the Spirit of truth in the heart, and to be led thereby. And I was to bring people off from Jewish ceremonies, and from men's inventions, and worldly doctrines ; and from their rudiments and creeds,—with their schools and colleges for making men ministers of Christ. And from all their images, and crosses, and sprinkling of infants ; and all their vain traditions, which they had gotten up since the Apostles' days, which the Lord's power, was gainst. And against all who preached, and not freely, as being such as had not received freely."

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose, from this statement, that the Quaker Reformation was a mere protesting movement, or a system of negatives. On the contrary, it began, as already pointed out, with reviving a great fundamental but forgotten Truth,—that of the Real Presence of Christ by His Spirit. This the Friends have happily kept in the forefront of those grand "Advices," which are periodically read in their meetings. It is the same truth as well expressed by William Penn, when he said : "*The Light of Christ within us, as God's gift for man's salvation, is the great Fundamental of our Religion.*"

We are therefore justified in saying that George Fox's proclamation of the Primitive Faith was based on the assertion of a *supreme* and *positive* truth, and not on mere negations.

He found the religious world divided between High Church professors, who based their faith largely on Church traditions, and the Puritan and "Evangelical" parties, who believed in the exclusive authority of Scripture. All these were making the Death of Christ the central truth of Christianity, to the displacement of a broader and more scriptural view. They were, in fact, almost entirely ignoring a truth which Fox felt to be *the main factor* in the relations of man to God. Fox had discovered—had had revealed to him—that it is the indwelling Spirit, the Living Christ, and not the Church, nor the Bible only (or even primarily), which is

the real Restorer and Guide of Life. He had reached out to a Living Person who is Divine, and he could rest no longer on a Book or a Creed.

Stephen Crisp—another of the founders of the Society—refers to the same discovery when he says, “There are two kinds of Faith. The one says, ‘I believe, because good men have told me, and because I find it in my Catechism and Prayer-Book.’ The other says, ‘I believe, because God hath visited me by His Love, and given me a personal assurance that He is my Deliverer.’”

Charles Kingsley proclaims the antiquity of this great Quaker principle in the following words. He says: “The doctrine of Christ in every man, as the indwelling Word of God—the Light who lights every one who comes into the world—is no peculiar tenet of the Quakers;—but one which runs through the whole of the Old and New Testament; and without which they would both be unintelligible: just as the same doctrine runs through the whole history of the Early Church for the first two centuries, and is the only explanation of them.”

The historian Bancroft says: “The mind of George Fox arrived at the conclusion that Truth is to be found by listening to the Voice of God in the soul. This principle contained a moral revolution. It established absolute freedom of mind (under the rule of Christ)—treading idolatry and superstition under foot, and entering the strongest protest against every form of hierarchy.” It is in this sense that we may say in the words of the poet—of that bright dawn of spiritual truth and liberty of which we are speaking—that

“Freedom reared in that august sunrise
Her beautiful bold brow:
When Rites and Forms before her burning eyes
Melted like snow.”

But when we speak of this great doctrine of Primitive Christianity and of Quakerism as fundamental truth, it is not to be understood that it is the only truth of importance. On examination it will be found—when held in its true sense—really to include or to lead on to all the great Facts referred to in the Apostles’ Creed: for, as promised by Christ, it leads into all truth. Our knowledge of God is progressive. Truth comes to us by degrees: largely according to faith and faithfulness. This was what George Fox meant, when he said he was called “to bring people to Christ, and to leave them there.” He knew that when a man had come in faith to this living Christ, he would seek more and more to learn of Christ, and to obey Christ, and to promote the cause of Christ; that he would honour and love the Bible, which testified of Christ; that he would rejoice exceedingly and increasingly in the assurance he had, through God’s manifestation and sacrifice in Christ; that he would feel the need and privilege of Prayer and of waiting on this gracious Lord for fuller enlightenment in the truth, and for guidance and help in all the concerns of life.

It was George Fox's faith in this principle of Christian growth and development, that explains the well-known story about William Penn and his sword. The incident may be briefly recalled to memory, somewhat thus: William Penn, in the early days of his changed life, though full of zeal for the Gospel as he then knew it, had not yet seen all the bearings of the great Truth which he had embraced. He had thrown himself heart and soul into the work of the Lord. He was preaching and writing continually, and was full of Christian activity. But he still wore his sword, after the fashion of the gentlemen of those times; and possibly thought little about it. The appearance of the young Christian soldier girt with a carnal weapon scandalized some of his elder Friends, who remonstrated with him about it. Penn, in his perplexity, sought counsel from his friend and leader, George Fox; and told him he had not seen the inconsistency of the thing, and did not wish to take any step out of mere imitation. Fox's advice was simple and courageous. He said: "As regards thy sword, wear it as long as thou feels easy with it." He had faith in the meekness and gentleness of Christ, and in the power of the Master to imbue His young disciple with His own Spirit; and he knew it was wise to leave growth and development in the hands of Him who is patient and all-wise,—who alone sees the capabilities of His servants, and the right time for leading them forward.

And so we find this great Fundamental Truth of a living and present Saviour underlying all that the early Friends taught. It was this that gave the unique character to their meetings for worship. It shaped and guided their ministry. It was at the root of all their testimonies, and their service for the Truth. It was to them the Power and Reality of the Gospel. It was "God's gift for man's salvation." And the reason is not far to seek. It meant to them the one Foundation, on which prophets and apostles and Primitive Christians had built—*Jesus Christ*.

In view of this mighty fact, they might well ask, "What need is there of a human priest, or a professional pastor, at the head of the congregation, when the Great High Priest—the Minister of ministers—is Himself really present? What need is there of a symbolical washing by outward water, when the real cleansing is applied direct to the soul by the Divine Baptizer Himself? What need is there of a formal ceremonial with outward bread and wine, when the soul is invited to the real table of the Lord, to partake of the veritable Bread of Life?"

It was well said of George Fox, that he did for Religion what Lord Bacon had done for philosophy,—he rescued it out of the hands of the Schoolmen (in this case the theologians), and showed it to be practical! Those who have looked much into works of Systematic Theology—Calvinistic or other—must have been struck by the contrast there presented, with the practical and unsophisticated character of the old Quaker teaching. It may be said of the early Friends—as Erasmus said of the Primitive Christians—that they were afraid to pronounce anything about God but

what was plainly revealed in Scripture. The Bible was their creed, interpreted by the Spirit of Christ, and they owned no other.

But the teaching of Fox and his coadjutors was not only practical. It was pre-eminently simple; and it was broad; and this simplicity and breadth reached to the very beginnings of Religion. The Protestant Theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—in which many of the early Friends had been trained—had been accustomed to say, “When you are converted, you will find God propitiated, and He will accept you for Christ’s sake.” But the Quaker theology took a totally different stand. It said, “God is on your side before you start; and He is,—by persuasion,—by the work of His Spirit,—seeking to start you Himself; and *Christ is the manifestation of His love, and not the cause of it.*”

A recent writer, in treating of the Quaker Reformation, has formulated the principles therein proclaimed, and has called them the “Ten Talents of Quakerism.” They may be summarized somewhat thus:—

1. God’s Spiritual Light that lighteth every man.
2. The indwelling of the Spirit with the disciple.
3. The Headship of Christ in His Church.
4. The priesthood of all believers.
5. The freedom of the Gospel Ministry.
6. The spiritual equality of the Sexes.
7. Spiritual Baptism, and Spiritual Communion.
8. The unlawfulness of war to the Christian.
9. The unlawfulness of oaths.
10. The duty of brotherly love, and of simplicity of life.

The list even in its bareness indicates the striking resemblance that existed between the Primitive Church and that of the early Friends, as to their creed, the character of their religious meetings, the basis of their ministry, and their views on Church Government. They both accepted in all its fulness the truth of the Real Presence and Headship of Christ: they were both free from the burden of Ritualism and Ceremonialism, and from the bondage and hindrance, in any form, of an order of clergy. They were both remarkable for their brotherly love, and for their care of the poor, the suffering, and the unfortunate.

The religious meetings in Apostolic times, though held on the same spiritual and free basis, took doubtless a somewhat different shape from the Quaker meetings—for reasons that are obvious. They were composed mainly of people just gathered out of heathenism, who had had practically no religious training; and the meetings had, therefore, of necessity, to be largely devoted to the work of “teaching.” That is, they sought in various ways, under the power of the Spirit, to remind and inform one another of the great facts of Religion, and of God’s dealings and revelations to men in the past: and this teaching-meeting was generally followed by a social gathering or “Love Feast,” for spiritual edification and devotion.

We may mention another point of comparison. There were some of the teachings of the early Friends, which, while really constituting part of the Quaker Reformation, were more of the nature of testimonies, specially belonging to that particular age. Such were doubtless based upon true principles into which these faithful disciples were led by the Spirit of Christ. But we have to remember that the application of principles may and does vary under the same Divine guidance. It had been so with the Primitive Christians. They had their strong testimony to bear about meats offered to Idols; against the use of blood; and so on. But these expressions of a true principle have long passed away, with the need of them. Though the injunction on these subjects was given to Gentile Christians, in the most solemn and unqualified terms (Acts xv. 28), no believer, Gentile or otherwise, feels any longer bound by it.

So with the early Friends. Admitting that there may have been in their protests against certain evils and extravagances of the time some degree of crudeness and exaggeration—for instance, in the use of what they called plain and truthful language; on the subject of dress, and personal demeanour—and in respect to some recreations; still they testified in their seventeenth-century style to some important truths that may now be upheld in other ways. In these things we have our own responsibility, which is not met by mere imitation.

We sometimes hear Quakerism described as if it were identical with what is known as "Evangelicalism," plus a few specialities about the Ordinances, War, and Oaths. This is a great mistake. We may appeal both to the early Friends, and to their contemporaries the "Evangelicals" of the seventeenth century; and we shall find the answer from each clear and unmistakable. Leaders of the "Evangelical" sects in those days—such as Baxter and Bunyan—never would admit that the fathers of Quakerism were in harmony with themselves as regards even primary Christian doctrine. They stigmatized them as *one-sided*,—as *tending to Socinianism*,—as *undervaluing the Bible*, and so on,—charges which one still hears at times applied by "Evangelicals" to old-fashioned Quakerism: though more unfounded statements as regards each particular, both then and now, could hardly be made. So far from being one-sided, they proclaimed afresh the *central* truth of Christianity. Their testimony to Christ, as Almighty and Divine, was a practical testimony;—and as such it was more definite and unequivocal than that of any other religious community. And their reverence and love for the Bible were so marked, that its plain teachings were accepted by them at great cost and suffering, on points respecting which other churches seem still "halting as between two opinions."

The Friends themselves—on this question of agreement in what were regarded as Fundamentals—were equally uncompromising. While they gladly avowed that they did not differ materially from many other religious communities, in what William Penn called "the common doctrines of

Christianity," they did not hesitate to assert that they differed almost radically in the definition—the understanding—and even in the place of some of these teachings.

The "Evangelical" sects—as we have already pointed out—declared, and still declare, their central truth to be the Death of Christ. The early Friends, going wider and deeper, proclaimed the great central and foundation truth to be Christ Himself;—the Living Saviour—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. They ignored no revealed truth. The human life of Christ—His death—His resurrection—His ascension—all for our sakes—they thankfully accepted and believed. But Christ the Living—the Indivisible,—He who had been God manifest in the flesh, and now is God manifest in the spirit,—was their foundation Rock. And on that Rock they built, and found safety and rest.

One characteristic achievement of the Quaker movement which is of primary importance was the rousing impulse it gave to individual Conscience. Christ—as these Reformers preached Him—was not only present in the Church as its Head, but He was present in the heart of each disciple. Therefore the Conscience—that wonderful organ or indicator, by which the Divine Presence is noted and its purpose revealed—was not to be a mere collective Church Instrument, interpreted and controlled by the priest or pastor, or even by the congregation; but a personal indicator, under Christ's direction, planted in the secret of each heart. Under this Divine Guidance, people were to think for themselves—seek for themselves—and act for themselves. And yet not as mere detached and isolated units. The one Supreme Guide who dwelt in each soul, and understood and loved each soul, became—as He was trusted—the true bond of union to His people. This practical faith in Christ's direct revelation of Himself to each believer—as it is held in humility and charity—is still found—even amidst great diversities of operations—to give true unity of purpose and an aggregate of wisdom; and so enables the Brotherhood to work harmoniously together for mutual help, and for the promotion of the truth. Here we have the true constitution of that union of many diverse spiritual natures, under the Headship and control of one Lord, which we recognise as a Divine institution, and which we call the Church.

A Church that felt itself so constituted would naturally be continually saying to its members—in other words the members would be continually saying to one another—"Christ is your Master; take heed to Him; take heed to His invisible and unsearchable influence,—the convictions of the Spirit,—the guidance and teaching of the Spirit,—the restraints of the Spirit." And the early Quaker Church *did* constantly reiterate this teaching. George Fox's epistles, and the addresses of his compatriots, are full of such injunctions. The supremacy of Conscience, controlled and enlightened by the Spirit of Christ, was in fact their prominent theme.

Personal Conscience was the rudder which, in the Divine hand, steered

their bark through the stormy sea which these brave men had to traverse. In obedience to it they went forth as Preachers; they held meetings; they organized communities for promoting God's truth; they went to prison; they laid down their lives; proving faithful to this Light of Christ in the Lamp of Conscience, even unto Death.

But further than that, they did their duty, and were seen to do their duty, in the petty details of every-day life. Perhaps this is as great a test of a tender and active conscience as can be found. George Fox tells us,—“When people came to have experience of Friends' honesty and faithfulness,—that they kept to a word in their dealings, and would not cheat them; but that if they sent a child to their shops for anything, they were as well used as if they had come themselves,—the lives of Friends did preach, and reached *the witness of God* in the people. Then the inquiry was, ‘Where is there a draper, or shopkeeper, or tailor, or shoemaker, or any other tradesman, that is a Quaker?’”

Another quiet, but invaluable characteristic, springing from the same root, and which has already borne good fruit,—but which needs to be much more cultivated in the world of politics and daily life,—is the absence, or at least the diminished power, of the spirit of self-seeking and of mere personal ambition. Oliver Cromwell testified to it as something unusual, when he said of the Friends, “Here is a people whom I cannot win with gifts, honours, office, or place.” John Bright once referred to the same characteristics when he said, “I am a member of a small but somewhat remarkable sect,—a religious body which had a remarkable origin, and in its early days at least a somewhat remarkable history. It is, of all the religious sects, the one that has most taught the equality and equal rights of man. And I venture to say it is remarkable for another thing,—that, probably more than any other body, within its borders and in its service, personal ambition is practically unknown.” John Bright adds, “I think much of my opinions, and much of my course, have been determined or at least greatly influenced by the training I received in that body.”

This active personal Conscience, which leads to a true self-reliance based on the assurance of Christ's presence and help, was the root of that sturdy independence of character which was once (and which is still, to some extent, let us hope) a distinguishing feature of Quaker people. It has been through this true staying power so much needed in the battle of life, that the individual conscience has come to tell upon the whole community. Probably when George Fox spoke of one true Quaker shaking the country for ten miles round, he had in view not merely or mainly preaching, or other public efforts; but rather this integrity and uprightness—this unswerving fidelity to the truth however manifest in the soul,—this conspicuous loyalty to Christ, which brought about the whole movement. We read that some Scotch earl, who had been dealing with certain of these uncompromising Friends, said,—The Quakers' loyalty is a qualified

loyalty: *it smells of Rebellion.*" To which one of them calmly replied "We understand not loyalty that is *not qualified*: qualified that is, with the fear of God, rather than of man."

And so this individuality—this unqualified loyalty to Christ,—told upon the churches and the nation in many important ways. For the churches the Quaker movement did much, by its broad teaching, to dissipate or at least to moderate the narrow Calvinism that prevailed in most of the Protestant communities. For the nation it won for us all Liberty of Conscience. "The struggle to secure this was carried on through forty years of bitter suffering, marked with many cruel martyrdoms, and the early Friends ultimately triumphed by the might of passive resistance wearying out persecution; and so they purchased for England the priceless jewel of religious liberty."

To the brave and good soldiers who fought in this long and arduous struggle, we may apply the words of an eminent writer, and say: "They were true patriots. They developed another kind of deliverance for their country, founded on the authority of Truth. They stood up against Tyrant and Priest. They witnessed against false social maxims, against superstitions, against all that was enslaving the soul. They proclaimed a living God; and they sought in all things to be faithful to their King."

METHODISM.

BY MRS. SHELDON AMOS.

WHEN I was invited to lecture here, I had never delivered a lecture anywhere, and looking at the list of subjects undertaken by distinguished persons for this Course, I was fainthearted, and though I did not like exactly to refuse a kind offer, I saw no excuse for my speaking on any great World-Religion. Of ancient Egypt alone I knew enough to know that I knew very little. So I looked further, and seeing one lecture on "The Mass," I perceived that a portion of Christianity might be admissible, and then it was clear that I had hereditary right to speak on Methodism; for after the name of John Wesley himself there occurs no name of a Methodist organizer and statesman so prominent as that of my grandfather, Dr. Bunting. And yet, though brought up in the innermost centre of English Methodism; it were with diffidence I should approach the effort to speak of the great American, Australian, and other branches of the Methodist Connexion, had I not, in the course of a life spent among singularly varied sets of human beings, found constantly a quite curious amount of ignorance about the meaning, history, condition, and aims of Methodism. If I can induce some of you to inform yourselves about what I take to be at once the most conservative, the most radical, the most practical, and the most intensely spiritual of Churches, the one which has most frequently been rent by the fierce determination of the violent who take the Kingdom of Heaven by storm, to press on always to the next step in spiritualized and spiritualizing popular religion and Church government, I shall not regret having come to try to speak to you to-day.

I say that Methodism is conservative. John Wesley inherited both the Puritan and the Anglican traditions; and so the spirit of the Reformation, and so his ideal, may be traced through many reformations back to primitive ideals. And John Wesley's four volumes of Sermons and his Notes on the New Testament are still the comprehensive, tolerant, broad, while minute and exact, body of theological teaching on which Methodist ministers are trained, and to which they declare their agreement before they are ordained to the ministry. Such a mass of theological teaching cannot be rigid as a short creed. For while these views exclude volumes wider and more elastic, there has been no proposal to dethrone them as Methodist standards. And in these are included sermons and notes which have caused High Churchmen and Low, Sacramentarians and Salvationists, alike to claim John Wesley as of their own particular way of thinking. I will not say that they are as wide as Christianity itself, but they are perhaps more Catholic than the tests of any other Church.

And Methodism is radical. No difficulty ever arose in Mr. Wesley's time, nor since, to prevent the most daintily trained clergyman, or son of a wealthy house, from finding himself either under the direction, or on equal brotherly terms, or in authority over some earnest stonemason, or workhouse lad, or tailor, whom the grace of God had endowed with a spiritual force and delicacy that made them true brothers in work for their Master. And while the ministers set apart to give their whole lives to the preaching of the Gospel have their own place in the system of Methodism, there are several distinct facts which prevent the spirit of sacerdotalism from getting hold on Methodists. It is true that none but ordained ministers have ever administered the Sacraments, but that is held to be a mere matter of order and organization, not of heaven-given special capacity as transmitters of a grace not to be obtained save through them. It could not be otherwise; for, while Mr. Wesley himself and many of his first coadjutors were ordained clergymen of the Church of England, at the time when the persecuting clergy of the Church of England drove the Methodists from the Communion Table, and even refused their children baptism and their dead burial, many of the ministers who met in solemn Conference, and after years of anxious consultation and of strong demand from the people, finally decided that it had become necessary for them to administer the Sacraments themselves to their people, had never been formally ordained by a bishop. Nothing would be more difficult than for a Methodist minister to trace any link to Apostolic Succession in the High Church materialistic sense. Nothing easier than for him to do so in the true spiritual sense of sonship in the Gospel. A solemn setting apart of men to the ministry, by ministers, had been the invariable rule since the first. Ordination by the laying on of hands did not become customary in Methodism till some forty years after that. So any theory of sacerdotalism would be a comedy in Methodism. Methodism holds that the special grace and wisdom needful for the due fulfilment of any calling in life, the ministry, banking, street sweeping, housewifery, is to be looked for by all alike in answer to faithful prayer. But Methodism is even more radical than this: from the beginning it has done what the most advanced political radicalism is only now with pains and difficulty advancing towards. And in Methodism the advanced political radicals often have their eyes closed on this one point, while the political and Methodistic conservatives are more clear-sighted, because Mr. Wesley was himself more clear-sighted. He admitted women to almost an equality with men throughout his religious system. It is true that there were no ordained women to offer their help to him as some good clergy did, and it is true that he never ordained or sent women on "rounds,"—now called "circuits," and stiffly organized—as preachers in those rough times. But the son of Susannah Wesley, the mother of the Church, the woman who in those days of excessive wifely obedience had quietly taken in the villagers to her kitchen when her clergyman-husband was long absent from his charge, and in spite

of his remonstrances prayed and sung and taught them as she was called of God to do; that woman's son, trained minutely by her in such methodical ways—of saving every moment of his days for orderly, predetermined purposes—has earned for him, and for the great multitude whom no man has numbered, who throughout the world have now for one hundred and fifty years followed him more or less truly, the name of *Methodists*; that woman's son was not likely to err as to the spiritual capacity and function of women in the Christian Church. Like St. Paul, whose teaching as to the position of women has been so strangely reversed and perverted, he recognised the duty of women extraordinarily called of God to preach, he advised and arranged that women's work should, so far as his organization was concerned, not force them into positions made too dangerous for them by the licentiousness and roughness of the day; but he, like St. Paul, was glad to learn from them, and was careful to explain that these were casual and temporary difficulties, and gave to women as much place and authority in the Church as was then practicable. Women preached largely, and with great effect, in their own neighbourhoods and where they were invited to go. And it was not till the year 1801, when more timid, smaller-natured men were at the helm, that the Methodist Conference decided that the women should no longer have a place upon the lists of regularly appointed ministers in the Methodist chapels. One of the women thus rudely and foolishly excluded from Wesleyan Methodist pulpits was the original of Dinah Morris, the aunt of George Eliot, Mrs. Samuel Evans, to whom the news was conveyed with discomfort by my great-uncle, then the superintendent of the "circuit" in which she lived. She joined the Kilhamites, a number of people who had already left the Methodist Connexion in 1796, because they felt the growth of that sacerdotal spirit which is always the haunting demon of the Christian minister, going about seeking whom it may devour.

The date of this division, or first offshoot from Wesleyan Methodism, is, however, significant, as all the early dates of Methodism are. John Wesley had been born into an England brutalized by the deadened condition of the Church and the comparative decay of Nonconformity, and had throughout his laborious life been pouring on the people the spirit of brotherhood in the Gospel which availed to save England from the excesses, while it prepared it to derive immense blessing from the true underlying principles, of the French Revolution. And after his death, while the mourning and disorganized body of ordained and unordained "helpers" of Mr. Wesley (as the ministers were then called) were casting about for an organization that should keep themselves and the people together, it is not to be wondered that there were errors both revolutionary and anti-revolutionary, which time has quietly operated upon till the reunion is not far distant now of the central body of Wesleyan Methodists with the original Kilhamite secession, and others that have followed on more or less similar grounds. There are not many Methodists now living who

would not say that each secession has taken from Methodism some of her saintliest and most intelligent children, and that Methodism has learned by each convulsion some lesson of democracy. In fact every point of Church organization which has been contended for by successive seceders has now been carried in the body from which they seceded. And now at last Methodism seems to have learned its lesson. The authorities no longer hasten to drive beyond the borders energetic seething souls, anxious to keep the Church up to the point reached in popular government outside, and the young energetic men are content to submit to some delay, some tight holding of the reins, for the sake of those who do not yet, but soon will, think with them. The history of the last two years in Methodism has been a strange proof of this. A few men felt that the methods of service, of attack upon wickedness and carelessness around, were antiquated and less useful than they had been; and though their ideas were by many thought wild, conceited, dangerous, impracticable, the general sense of the Church was that room, time, money, and permission ought to be given for a fair trial. That the wisdom of the forward movement has been abundantly proved by success is known, I do not doubt, to some here. To how great an extent it has been successful it would need, in these days of quick and perfected communication, a world-wide knowledge to estimate. Meanwhile Methodists thank God and take courage, and turn with a bolder face than ever to the surrounding masses of the people, rich and poor, Christian and non-Christian, and say: "Here is a form of Church organization which offers to you full use of every faculty you have, naturally or by acquirement, if only it is unreservedly devoted to the service of God and of His people the world over." That is the keystone of Methodism, personal consecration; the consecration which is possible only to the soul that is consciously forgiven and at one with God, at one in will and in deed, carrying out His purposes, fulfilling His plans for the world day by day in every form of activity possible to humanity,—at one with God in Christ.

Methodism says that this union is necessarily a conscious one; that with uncertainty as to the favour and love of God, as to the forgiveness of personal sin, there cannot co-exist the abounding joy, the impelling eagerness of love, which is the spring of practical Christianity, which is true socialism. Once it is realized that we are God's children and it becomes natural that, like Him, we should care for the poor and the unhappy; that, like Him, we should take great part in the conduct of politics; that, like Him, we should wage war against vice and cruelty; like Him, love peace and pursue it; like Him, of set purpose use our lives and our deaths for the good of others, seeking not our own.

But this is not a new doctrine introduced by Methodism, though it is the attracting force which has made Methodism—in spite of the hugeness of the numbers of people who call themselves Methodists all over the world, some five and a half millions—like a freemasonry. They may be

Episcopahan in America, Calvinistic in Wales, Arminian in England and Australia and the South Sea Islands, and may vary in many small matters. In the great matter there is unity : we know our sins forgiven, and we rejoice in the love of God. I do not mean that all who call themselves Methodists are faithful ; I do not mean that all born into Methodist houses live as the children of godly parents should do ; I do not mean that we are a mass of saints. No, indeed ; I mean that every loyal and true member of this great Church holds the doctrine that this peace and joy in believing is a privilege from which only personal lack of faith or obedience to God's law can hold him. That it is God's will that he should share His life and work. May God grant us all to see this truth ! It is a truth which has wrought the three great revolutions of the world in Christian times. St. Paul, earnest and energetic, distinguished for learning and zeal, conscientious, was but one man among many until one day he saw himself as he was in relation to Christ, and saw in the same critical hour what God in Christ was ready to be to him. He knew his sins forgiven : he knew that a new life had begun in him. He was conscious that the spirit of God dwelt in him witnessing to his spirit that he was the child of God, and leading, restraining, teaching him in all the ways in which till then he had relied on his own judgment. The opponents of Christianity, ignoring Christ's own promise of such teaching by His Spirit, attribute the change of the then known world from paganism of the most vicious type to Christianity to Paul, the man who had passed through this great crisis—this judgment of himself and of his relationship to God. But as the centuries passed on, and the Church had grown respectable and powerful, this necessity, that each individual should in the same way see himself and herself in the light of heaven, and should receive the Spirit of God in order to live a true Christian life, receded into the background. Persecution over, there was not the same obvious desperate necessity for each to be sure of a doctrine for which they might be called on to give up everything in the world. And the Christian Churches, while maturing in doctrine in some directions, grew rotten in doctrine in others, and the people called by that name ceased generally to understand that each one must live by conscious union with Christ as the only Saviour from sin and Teacher in the ways of life. The Church could speak with human voice ; and ears were stopped, and did not listen for the inward voice of the Spirit. Then came Luther, and once more the Christian world rang with the teaching that this man had passed through a great crisis in life ; had seen himself, as Paul had, in his rue colours ; had seen, as Paul had, the promise of the indwelling Spirit ; had received power once more to rouse the sleeping world, and proclaim to it the blessed fact that each one might know his sins forgiven, and learn by an ever-present Helper to live a life of purity and joyful brotherliness in the world, by word and deed—by political and religious activity to make it easier for those around him to live good lives, to return to

would not say that each secession has taken from Methodism some of her saintliest and most intelligent children, and that Methodism has learned by each convulsion some lesson of democracy. In fact every point of Church organization which has been contended for by successive seceders has now been carried in the body from which they seceded. And now at last Methodism seems to have learned its lesson. The authorities no longer hasten to drive beyond the borders energetic seething souls, anxious to keep the Church up to the point reached in popular government outside, and the young energetic men are content to submit to some delay, some tight holding of the reins, for the sake of those who do not yet, but soon will, think with them. The history of the last two years in Methodism has been a strange proof of this. A few men felt that the methods of service, of attack upon wickedness and carelessness around, were antiquated and less useful than they had been; and though their ideas were by many thought wild, conceited, dangerous, impracticable, the general sense of the Church was that room, time, money, and permission ought to be given for a fair trial. That the wisdom of the forward movement has been abundantly proved by success is known, I do not doubt, to some here. To how great an extent it has been successful it would need, in these days of quick and perfected communication, a world-wide knowledge to estimate. Meanwhile Methodists thank God and take courage, and turn with a bolder face than ever to the surrounding masses of the people, rich and poor, Christian and non-Christian, and say: "Here is a form of Church organization which offers to you full use of every faculty you have, naturally or by acquirement, if only it is unreservedly devoted to the service of God and of His people the world over." That is the keystone of Methodism, personal consecration; the consecration which is possible only to the soul that is consciously forgiven and at one with God, at one in will and in deed, carrying out His purposes, fulfilling His plans for the world day by day in every form of activity possible to humanity,—at one with God in Christ.

Methodism says that this union is necessarily a conscious one; that with uncertainty as to the favour and love of God, as to the forgiveness of personal sin, there cannot co-exist the abounding joy, the impelling eagerness of love, which is the spring of practical Christianity, which is true socialism. Once it is realized that we are God's children and it becomes natural that, like Him, we should care for the poor and the unhappy; that, like Him, we should take great part in the conduct of politics; that, like Him, we should wage war against vice and cruelty; like Him, love peace and pursue it; like Him, of set purpose use our lives and our deaths for the good of others, seeking not our own.

But this is not a new doctrine introduced by Methodism, though it is the attracting force which has made Methodism—in spite of the hugeness of the numbers of people who call themselves Methodists all over the world, some five and a half millions—like a freemasonry. They may be

Episcopalian in America, Calvinistic in Wales, Arminian in England and Australia and the South Sea Islands, and may vary in many small matters. In the great matter there is unity: we know our sins forgiven, and we rejoice in the love of God. I do not mean that all who call themselves Methodists are faithful; I do not mean that all born into Methodist houses live as the children of godly parents should do; I do not mean that we are a mass of saints. No, indeed; I mean that every loyal and true member of this great Church holds the doctrine that this peace and joy in believing is a privilege from which only personal lack of faith or obedience to God's law can hold him. That it is God's will that he should share His life and work. May God grant us all to see this truth! It is a truth which has wrought the three great revolutions of the world in Christian times. St. Paul, earnest and energetic, distinguished for learning and zeal, conscientious, was but one man among many until one day he saw himself as he was in relation to Christ, and saw in the same critical hour what God in Christ was ready to be to him. He knew his sins forgiven: he knew that a new life had begun in him. He was conscious that the spirit of God dwelt in him witnessing to his spirit that he was the child of God, and leading, restraining, teaching him in all the ways in which till then he had relied on his own judgment. The opponents of Christianity, ignoring Christ's own promise of such teaching by His Spirit, attribute the change of the then known world from paganism of the most vicious type to Christianity to Paul, the man who had passed through this great crisis—this judgment of himself and of his relationship to God. But as the centuries passed on, and the Church had grown respectable and powerful, this necessity, that each individual should in the same way see himself and herself in the light of heaven, and should receive the Spirit of God in order to live a true Christian life, receded into the background. Persecution over, there was not the same obvious desperate necessity for each to be sure of a doctrine for which they might be called on to give up everything in the world. And the Christian Churches, while maturing in doctrine in some directions, grew rotten in doctrine in others, and the people called by that name ceased generally to understand that each one must live by conscious union with Christ as the only Saviour from sin and Teacher in the ways of life. The Church could speak with human voice; and ears were stopped, and did not listen for the inward voice of the Spirit. Then came Luther, and once more the Christian world rang with the teaching that this man had passed through a great crisis in life; had seen himself, as Paul had, in his rue colours; had seen, as Paul had, the promise of the indwelling Spirit; had received power once more to rouse the sleeping world, and proclaim to it the blessed fact that each one might know his sins forgiven, and learn by an ever-present Helper to live a life of purity and joyful brotherliness in the world, by word and deed—by political and religious activity to make it easier for those around him to live good lives, to return to

God, and to find the same help in life as himself. But, just as in St. Paul's time this new spirit in the people led to persecution by the authorities, who, conscious in themselves that they did not subject their actions to the same law, thought their power threatened by an appeal to the Supreme Authority, so in Luther's time, the new consciousness of right and justice caused wars to rage and a general seething unrest of the people of Europe, until the popular spirit was exhausted for a while, and lay down in deathlike sleep; and then the time of revolution followed on, in which Wesley, and the group of remarkable men and women who wrought with him, once more, in more hopeful surroundings, preached, and showed in their own lives that Christianity is not an authoritative dogma to be taught and submitted to, but a life of spiritual union with God in His Son Jesus Christ; that each one born into the world is born to see God as a Father who has in Christ shown Himself to be Love, and who dwells by His Spirit in the innermost secret place of life in every one who receives Him, in such a manner that that person cannot but be conscious that sin is forgiven, that the law of God has become the expression of his own opinion and will, that he sees it in all ways to be good and to be desired. The Spirit of God witnesses with his spirit that he is the child of God. Thus, the essence of Methodism is simply that secret of Christianity which has again and again remoulded society. At each fresh activity of this motor-nervous system of the Christian body a great advance has been made. It is true that each time the period of activity has been followed by relapse, but it never has been as before, and each time the social system has been more fit to take a deeper and wider impression. And now, again, I believe that the same doctrine has begun to give a fresh impulse to a far wider world than ever. Salvationism—an offshoot of irrepressible vigour from a former offshoot that did not find room enough in the Wesleyan Methodism which was beginning to be respectable, and to frown on too much individuality in obedience to inward impulsion—Salvationism has touched the brutalized masses in our own country and elsewhere with a light and flame from heaven, and is sending such enthusiastic embassies to India as to convince the people there (as no previous missions have done) that there is power and truth in Christianity, since these preachers of it, like their Master, strip themselves of all their advantages and gladly lay down their life if only they may convince the people that they have a Father in heaven, a Saviour from sin, a Spirit of purity and wisdom, to lead them into all truth.

Salvationism is the offspring of Methodism, and is Methodism adapted to one section of society. But Methodism has also both its statelier moods and its *bourgeois* developments. It has its "churches" with liturgical services; it has its plain chapels with hearty comfortable congregational worship; and it has its lovefeasts and class-meetings. It is, in fact, less a material organization than a vital force. I believe that the next few years may see it doing once more what it did in Wesley's own day, pouring into

churches here and abroad, new and old, and into a too respectable Nonconformity—for Nonconformity, by instilling good principles into the working classes, always tends to produce *nouveaux riches*, who grow smug and too respectable for anything good—a vivacity, an audacity, of Christian vigour which must remould society again. It has been said lately, “We are all socialists now-a-days,” and it is to be hoped that at least the religious are going to prove themselves so.

In John Wesley’s idea Methodism was not to found a Church. He permitted no Methodist service to be held in church hours, and even to the present day in quiet villages the same filial respect is shown to the National Church. The change came when the numbers of persons excluded from the Communion, and treated as pariahs by the clergy, grew so great that it was a practical inconvenience for them to be unable to use the best hours of the Sunday for the services to which they were attached. But the spirit of dissent which now exists in Methodism is an unnatural excrescence, and will die down again as soon as fresh life in the Church of England causes the hand of brotherly love to be stretched out. What I have said about the width of Methodist standards of doctrine suffices to indicate that the narrowness of dissent is non-Methodistic. The old name of “the Society called Methodists” will always be cherished. And in this it has a great advantage. We are sometimes told that the Church of England is the historical Church, or the Church of Rome. But we say no: the historical Church is, of course, a body of people, called by any name or names, who freely seek for all good things in the past in various developments of Christianity, who exclude no help or beauty that can be proved to be helpful or beautiful now; who are ready to learn from comrades now living, or who have passed away to the Church above; a body, in fact, the heir of the saints of former days, aiming at training saints now, and that is making Church history every day.

This Society has some ways of conducting its religious life that are subjects of curiosity and misunderstanding more than most religious organizations. Especially I mean class-meetings and lovefeasts, and of these I wish to speak. Lovefeasts are, at all events for the present, rather in abeyance, or take a different form. As I remember them, they were occasions on which pieces of currant-bread and water were passed from pew to pew in the chapel, and then, interspersed with singing and prayer, one short speech after another was made by whoever chose, about the life of Christ in the heart. One would be full of joy and praise for help in trouble, or added and sharpened delight in happy circumstances. Another would tell of heavy-heartedness and clinging faith and hope in God. There was always a feeling of special approach to the presence of God, and I think these meetings were good. Of course they gave opening by their popularity to many strange speeches; and I must claim for Methodism a greater capacity for humour in religion than any other Church. We are not afraid of humour. It is a part of the human nature which our Master

took upon Himself ; and when the human being is at one with Him, fun is part of the natural play of vitality. But it is kindly, decorous, and well kept in hand. Many and many a story of queer sayings in lovefeasts I could tell if this were the opportunity. They were domestic gatherings. Now-a-days we meet differently, perhaps not so familiarly. Class-meetings, however, have not suffered much change. They are usually small gatherings of some dozen to twenty people for strictly devotional purposes, and for giving and getting sympathy and mutual advice in leading a godly life. Very helpful, indeed, they are, and the tie that binds members of a class can become exceedingly valuable. They vary as infinitely as the characteristic of the leader, or person who is accountable to Methodism for those put under his or her spiritual charge ; as infinitely as the characteristics of the members. In some cases it is a stiffer, in some a more homely meeting. But in every case the word of God is accepted as the rule of life, and the little groups try to help each other to conform to it ; and membership in one of these classes constitutes membership in the Methodist Society. We do not count our members by communicants or by attendance at our places of worship, so that when I quoted the numbers of Methodists all over the world as being five and a half millions, other Churches, who count by church attendance, would have multiplied that by five.

These domesticated groups are a great help to Methodist ministers in getting to know the needs of their people. For the minister is bound to visit all the classes of his congregations once every quarter of a year, and so gets a quite rare opportunity of gauging the spiritual tone. He learns where to look for the spiritually minded men and women who will be likely to be useful workers in the spiritual and temporal offices of the Church ; where the lads are growing who will make good ministers, and should be encouraged, and where he can best get help for some doubtful or tender spirit whose troubles have been confided to him. And the people get to know him—a very important thing in Methodism. For Methodist ministers are not put in charge of a congregation for life, or till a better opening comes. They change from place to place every three years, alternating between country and town charges, learning life and people more thoroughly than any other body of men, and carrying with them from place to place a sense of brotherhood, and an actuality of friendship which welds Methodists of all classes and all places together. This healthy circulation was the invariable rule ; indeed, the change used to be actually, and still theoretically may be, made every year. But for some purposes it is becoming desirable to give longer tenure to some few ministers, and the ecclesiastical system I have attempted to indicate is easily elastic enough for that.

But there is another peculiar institution in Methodism, which greatly modifies the relation of the ministers and the people, and which enables me to say that, with the exception of the administration of the Sacra

ments, there is no function of the Christian ministry which Methodist ministers do not share with the laity. The pastoral office is shared with the men and women leaders of classes, the ecclesiastical rule of the Church is shared with laymen (and in the lower branches theoretically with women), and even the office of preaching is shared very largely with lay preachers who live by their own labour and give their Sundays to preaching in their own neighbourhoods, and sometimes in distant parts of the country. The office of a local preacher is one that has always been held by men of the most various attainments and positions in the world, and much of the vigorous life of the Methodist Society is owing to the fact that the ministry is thus felt to be not a far-off office, but one of the functions of the Christian life exercisable by any one whose capacity for teaching is recognised by a number of his fellows. Many a useful local preacher has wished to be a minister set apart and ordained, but his suitability for Orders has not been clear to the authorities. It is evident that "priests and people," as they are commonly classed elsewhere, are more intimately and socially close together in Methodism than elsewhere. Yet there is no lack of reverence or esteem for those who deem themselves called, and whose call is recognised by the Church, to give themselves entirely to the work of the ministry. There is no superstition about Orders, but the ministry is considered the highest vocation in life, and worthy so to be held in reverence.

I do not pretend to do justice to my subject. I can do nothing more than hint at a few of the salient features of Methodism. But I can end my lecture to-day as some others could not do. You were not, I suppose, invited to become disciples of Confucianism or Shintôism, nor, I hope, of that oddity now called Buddhism which is not Buddhism; but I have the happiness to be able to say that I have no desire to take leave of any of you. I rather say, speaking in the name of Methodists in general, to all and everybody the round world over, "Come with us, and we will try to do you good."

IRVINGISM :

On,

THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

By EDWARD MILLER, M.A.

THE system of religion popularly known as Irvingism, or as styled by the members more ambitiously "The Catholic Apostolic Church," is emphatically a child of the nineteenth century. It took its rise out of the study of prophecy as it was pursued in the first half of that period.

The atmosphere may be said to have been ripe with undefined expectation of coming change when Edward Irving, then a young Scotch Presbyterian and assistant of Chalmers, was elected to the pastorate of the Caledonian Church in London. The congregation consisted of some fifty people when he came in July, 1822. Before long the little chapel in Hatton Garden was crowded to overflowing. Led by Canning and Mackintosh, the society of the day flocked to hear the great preacher. Many people could not come within the sound of his voice. Lady Jersey, the celebrated leader of fashion, was seen sitting on the pulpit steps. Irving reached at a bound the zenith of his popularity, which thenceforwards waned gradually till his death.

Into the tide was drawn a clever but eccentric banker, who belonged to one of the old Scotch families, Henry Drummond, owner of a beautiful place at Albury, near Guildford. Here in 1826, and in the four following years, Mr. Drummond invited a body of men to discuss prophecy with reference to the events which were at hand. The list of those who came in one year or other included men of different alliances and different opinions, of whom only a small portion became ultimately members of the future religious body. They believed that the millennium was close at hand, and "that a great period of 1,260 years commenced in the reign of Justinian and terminated at the French Revolution, and that the vials of the Apocalypse began then to be poured out; that our blessed Lord will shortly appear, and that, therefore, it is the duty of all who so believe to press these considerations on the attention of all men."

The meetings were arrested by the appearance in Scotland of what some took to be miraculous powers, manifested in cures of illness, and in the utterance of unknown tongues. John Bate Cardale, who afterwards became the first "apostle," went with a party to pursue investigations on the spot. And in the winter after his return, in Irving's congregation, in Cardale's house, and elsewhere, prayers were continually offered for the ap-

pearance of prophets and apostles. At length, on April 30th, 1831, Mrs. Cardale spoke with great solemnity in "a tongue," and "prophesied." In course of time she was followed by others, and at length scarcely a service occurred which was not interrupted by such strange utterances. Irving did not know what to do: he had evoked a power which was beyond his control.

These events caused great astonishment, and people came from all quarters to hear the prophesyings. But in course of time, as they were generally considered to lack the signs of genuineness, and the "unknown tongues" presented no resemblance to any kind of language, the interest subsided.

After various difficulties, amongst which were the removal of Irving from the Caledonian Church in consequence of heretical teaching upon the mysterious subject of our Lord's nature, and his deposition from the Presbyterian ministry, the new religious body was gradually organized. Cardale, Drummond, and ten others, were supposed to be called by the prophets to be apostles; and on the 7th of July, 1835, they met together for the solemn appointment of the "twelve" by the assembled Church. Unfortunately, they had reckoned without consent in one case. Mr. David Dow, a Presbyterian minister who had been deposed because of acknowledging the tongues, was not there. The meeting was postponed a week, and two of the most influential went to Scotland to bring the recusant, but to no purpose. On the 14th, the members fondly persuaded themselves that they found a precedent in the case of the traitor Judas, and chose two, one of whom the prophets declared to be the twelfth apostle.

It is remarkable that their greatest man—in fact, the only man who was known at all widely outside of the immediate connections of the Irvingite body in the field of religion—was never advanced to one of their highest offices. He was made an angel, it is true, or as they consider the office, a bishop; but even then he was under the strict domination of apostles, and even of prophets. Disappointment settled over him: he had expected a grand and overwhelming outpouring of the Spirit, and a dramatic conversion of multitudes. In decaying health, he started northwards to woo such an occurrence. It came not; and he died at Glasgow in December, 1834, a broken-down, worn-out old man, though at the age only of forty-two.

After their "separation," as they termed it, these apostles, accompanied by some prophets and evangelists, retired to Albury to build up their system. They believed that our Lord always intended to appoint twenty-four apostles, twelve for the Jews, and twelve for the Gentiles,—the former twelve to start the Church, and the latter twelve to present it, Jews and Gentiles, to Him at His second coming. They supposed that He began to execute this intention in the appointment of the St. Paul and St. Barnabas; but that owing to the sin of the world the work of those two eminent apostles ended in failure. The apostles died, and as Irvingites imagine, the Church "fell like a dead thing to the ground," till at the close approach

of His second Advent in the early part of the nineteenth century, according to their studies of prophecy, He appointed Cardale, Drummond, and their colleagues to accomplish what St. Paul and St. Barnabas were unable to effect.

Animated by these grand imaginations, they perfected at Albury their very elaborate system upon the pattern of the Tabernacle of old, and upon the principles promulgated in the Pentateuch. And they drew up three "Testimonies" couched in lofty language, for presentation to the Potentates of the world and the bishops of the Church universal. Then they mapped out Europe into "Tribes," of which each apostle took one under his charge. They were fully convinced that the time was short, that their operations must be extended all over the Church; and they looked, like Irving, for some wondrous revolution in which the heavenly will would be made manifest, and all the world would be silent before Him, and before them as His twelve chosen and effective ministers.

With these hopes they went forth early in the year 1838, each apostle being accompanied by his prophet, evangelist, and pastor, thus presenting an epitome of the fourfold ministry which obtained amongst them. It was supposed that the second Advent would probably occur at the end of 1260 days from their "separation" to be apostles; and they were ordered therefore to return to Albury by Christmas, 1838, in readiness for a momentous event.

In a few cases the testimonies were presented, such as to Cardinal Acton for the Pope, and to Prince Metternich for the Emperor of Austria. The several apostles did what they could in a quiet way, being especially observant of one of the orders given them, which appears strangely inconsistent with their character as apostles, entrusted, as they imagined, with inconceivably awful responsibilities, viz., to remember that they went only in the character of "private individuals, as learners and observers rather than teachers." Their achievements were exceedingly scanty. Some people in Switzerland, a few in France, some more in Germany, made up the sum of their conversions. In Roman Catholic quarters the progress was nothing at all. The world went on as usual, and religious life moved undisturbed by even a ripple on the surface. Operations were conducted in so inodest and refined a manner, and were so devoid of consequences of any sort, that none of those commotions which marked the track of St. Paul and St. Barnabas on their journey indicated anywhere the presence and energy of any one of these modern apostles.

They met at Christmas without any remarkable occurrence, and separated again for their respective provinces. Mr. Woodhouse, despairing of Austria, sought the more congenial soil of America. As in St. Paul's journeys, the character of the first determined the nature of the second attempt. Success did not crown their efforts. The Church may be said to have been neither better nor worse for what they did as well as they could manage. But at home troubles arose; and at the end of 1839, the senior apostle sent to recall

them ; and in June, 1840, just five years after their formal separation, they returned, never again to act in "Twelve-fold unity," and never again to venture upon such an effort as to seek to unite the entire Christian Church in preparation for the Lord's arrival.

It may be remembered that the apostles owed their original place in the body to the prophets, who called them each individually to the office which they were supposed to hear. After long preparation, the apostles had gone forth to their work, and what they effected was afterwards described by one of them in the words, "The apostles and those with them confess their failure." Consequently, confidence in them had fallen, faults were freely found, changes were advocated, and the prophets took advantage of their position as having been prior to the apostles, at least in point of time, to rise virtually in rebellion. Cardale could not suppress these uprisings, and it required the entire force of all together to reduce the body to working order. The apostles met, and issued a document pointing out in severe language that the prophets must be subject to the apostles, that their utterances must be accepted by the apostles before they could be considered to be prophecies, and that no Council, such as their "Council of Zion," which was thenceforward suspended, could be considered to have authority over the apostles. On no other terms would they—the apostles—act or undertake the responsibility of the care and guidance of the Churches.

The uprising was repressed, but the unity and co-operation of the apostles was irretrievably broken. Mackenzie, the last elected, retired, and never afterwards acted with them. In fact, after a few years had elapsed, it seemed as if the body would come to an end. Cardale retired for three years. Drummond thought so little of a tremendous responsibility resting upon him in preparing the whole Church for the second Advent, that he consented to represent his county in Parliament during the last twelve years of his life, and did so with much assiduity and success. During that time he told one of his earlier friends "that he believed they were all in shipwreck, and that the best advice he could give was that each should lay hold of any plank within reach." Dalton went back to his work as an English clergyman. The acknowledgment of failure made by Mr. Sitwell, another of them, has been already noticed. The numbers of the sect, never in correspondence with their ambitious principal, unless it was in the infant days of Irving's first preaching, were reduced. Yet they continued in a small sphere of action, and made some developments in a direction never dreamed of at first.

When the apostles were endeavouring to extend their boundaries on the Continent, and were thinking how they could draw into their circle members of foreign Churches, they became forcibly impressed with the utter impossibility of attracting Roman Catholics and others to a mode of worship constructed mainly upon Presbyterian models. They had studied the Old Testament, and had entered deeply into the ceremonial and symbolism of the Jewish Law. So that it was not a great step in their ideas when in a

of His second Advent in the early part of the nineteenth century, according to their studies of prophecy, He appointed Cardale, Drummond, and their colleagues to accomplish what St. Paul and St. Barnabas were unable to effect.

Animated by these grand imaginations, they perfected at Albury their very elaborate system upon the pattern of the Tabernacle of old, and upon the principles promulgated in the Pentateuch. And they drew up three "Testimonies" couched in lofty language, for presentation to the Potentates of the world and the bishops of the Church universal. Then they mapped out Europe into "Tribes," of which each apostle took one under his charge. They were fully convinced that the time was short, that their operations must be extended all over the Church; and they looked, like Irving, for some wondrous revolution in which the heavenly will would be made manifest, and all the world would be silent before Him, and before them as His twelve chosen and effective ministers.

With these hopes they went forth early in the year 1838, each apostle being accompanied by his prophet, evangelist, and pastor; thus presenting an epitome of the fourfold ministry which obtained amongst them. It was supposed that the second Advent would probably occur at the end of 1260 days from their "separation" to be apostles; and they were ordered therefore to return to Albury by Christmas, 1838, in readiness for a momentous event.

In a few cases the testimonies were presented, such as to Cardinal Acton for the Pope, and to Prince Metternich for the Emperor of Austria. The several apostles did what they could in a quiet way, being especially observant of one of the orders given them, which appears strangely inconsistent with their character as apostles, entrusted, as they imagined, with inconceivably awful responsibilities, viz., to remember that they went only in the character of "private individuals, as learners and observers rather than teachers." Their achievements were exceedingly scanty. Some people in Switzerland, a few in France, some more in Germany, made up the sum of their conversions. In Roman Catholic quarters the progress was nothing at all. The world went on as usual, and religious life moved undisturbed by even a ripple on the surface. Operations were conducted in so modest and refined a manner, and were so devoid of consequences of any sort, that none of those commotions which marked the track of St. Paul and St. Barnabas on their journey indicated anywhere the presence and energy of any one of these modern apostles.

They met at Christmas without any remarkable occurrence, and separated again for their respective provinces. Mr. Woodhouse, despairing of Austria, sought the more congenial soil of America. As in St. Paul's journeys, the character of the first determined the nature of the second attempt. Success did not crown their efforts. The Church may be said to have been neither better nor worse for what they did as well as they could manage. But at home troubles arose; and at the end of 1839, the senior apostle sent to recall

them; and in June, 1840, just five years after their formal separation, they returned, never again to act in "Twelve-fold unity," and never again to venture upon such an effort as to seek to unite the entire Christian Church in preparation for the Lord's arrival.

It may be remembered that the apostles owed their original place in the body to the prophets, who called them each individually to the office which they were supposed to bear. After long preparation, the apostles had gone forth to their work, and what they effected was afterwards described by one of them in the words, "The apostles and those with them confess their failure." Consequently, confidence in them had fallen, faults were freely found, changes were advocated, and the prophets took advantage of their position as having been prior to the apostles, at least in point of time, to rise virtually in rebellion. Cardale could not suppress these uprisings, and it required the entire force of all together to reduce the body to working order. The apostles met, and issued a document pointing out in severe language that the prophets must be subject to the apostles, that their utterances must be accepted by the apostles before they could be considered to be prophecies, and that no Council, such as their "Council of Zion," which was thenceforward suspended, could be considered to have authority over the apostles. On no other terms would they—the apostles—act or undertake the responsibility of the care and guidance of the Churches.

The uprising was repressed, but the unity and co-operation of the apostles was irretrievably broken. Mackenzie, the last elected, retired, and never afterwards acted with them. In fact, after a few years had elapsed, it seemed as if the body would come to an end. Cardale retired for three years. Drummond thought so little of a tremendous responsibility resting upon him in preparing the whole Church for the second Advent, that he consented to represent his county in Parliament during the last twelve years of his life, and did so with much assiduity and success. During that time he told one of his earlier friends "that he believed they were all in shipwreck, and that the best advice he could give was that each should lay hold of any plank within reach." Dalton went back to his work as an English clergyman. The acknowledgment of failure made by Mr. Sitwell, another of them, has been already noticed. The numbers of the sect, never in correspondence with their ambitious principal, unless it was in the infant days of Irving's first preaching, were reduced. Yet they continued in a small sphere of action, and made some developments in a direction never dreamed of at first.

When the apostles were endeavouring to extend their boundaries on the Continent, and were thinking how they could draw into their circle members of foreign Churches, they became forcibly impressed with the utter impossibility of attracting Roman Catholics and others to a mode of worship constructed mainly upon Presbyterian models. They had studied the Old Testament, and had entered deeply into the ceremonial and symbolism of the Jewish Law. So that it was not a great step in their ideas when in a

French church, upon seeing a priest enter vested, one of their prophets exclaimed, "These are the vestments which the Lord would have for His service, in which His priesthood should appear before Him to minister His holy rites in His presence." And now a study of the early Liturgies of the Church led them to make up a ritual which is dignified, and has many points to recommend it in the eyes of such as are good judges of such things.

But they also adopted another peculiar ceremony which has landed them in many inconsistencies. Building upon the sealing of the 144,000 as described in the Apocalypse, they embraced the idea that sealing is necessary in order to escape "the great tribulation," which they expect at our Lord's arrival; that their apostles have their power of sealing; that those who are thus sealed will follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth; that according to the passage in the Revelation xii., 12,000 must be sealed from each tribe; and that when this is accomplished the Lord will come. Sealing is not bestowed till the age of twenty years, and then only by imposition of the hands of an apostle, or as the apostles are now all dead but one, of a coadjutor-apostle.

This rite was thus started in all the stern grandeur which characterized the doings of the earlier Irvingites. Indeed, if they adopted such a ceremony at all, the model in the Apocalypse required nothing else. But no lesson has been taught anywhere more thoroughly than this in the history of Irvingism, viz., that grand conception and humble action do not ordinarily coincide. Two apostles absolutely refused to seal, so that in their tribes there must have been an absolute vacuum, besides the existence of disagreement amongst the twelve in such an important matter. Moreover, various reasons of a different kind have made the number in several of the tribes infinitesimally small. At one time, the idea was promulgated that the apostles who died before sealing their number would make it up in the next world. Now it is asserted, that there was never any authorized intention of making up the number in each tribe. This affords a specimen of the manner in which Irvingites are forced by the stern logic of life to turn their backs upon their past history, and to make their doctrines square with facts when facts absolutely refuse to square with doctrines.

Their subsequent career has been comparatively uneventful. There is but little proselytizing; and the members do not press their belief where it is not welcome. The apostles have died all but one, W. Woodhouse. The death of the first in 1855 caused a sensation, but he was the one who had retired before. He was followed in the same year by two, and a large gap was made in the number. Drummond and Perceval (son of the Prime Minister shot by Bellingham) died in 1859, and three more before 1866, Dalton in 1871, Cardale in 1877, and Armstrong about the same time. What will happen when Mr. Woodhouse goes, no one knows. It may however be confidently concluded that some arrangement will be made, however it may collide with past principles and practice.

The character of Irvingism is best learnt from the history of the sect. But it is necessary to describe, as far as space will allow, some of the leading tenets.

The pivot on which all turns is the immediate expectation of our Lord's second Advent. With many of them this is a most lively motive to conscientious life: with many of course what is long-delayed, and after having been expected time after time has been withheld, ceases to have such effect. The meaning of their apostolate is that our Lord is supposed to have found that the Church by itself had been unable to get ready for Him to come, and has therefore Personally interposed, speaking through prophets, and has sent apostles, officers not of separate Churches or Branches of the Church, but of the Church Universal, to make special preparations for Him. The apostles are thus supposed to be the link between heaven and earth. Hence it is, that claiming this superior and universal position, above Pope or Archbishop, they styled themselves "The Catholic Apostolic Church," and protest against being called a sect, though that name is all that can be conceded to them by those who see no foundation for their claim, and would be themselves compromised by admitting it.

Another of their leading tenets is the existence of a fourfold ministry, which they base upon St. Paul's words (Eph. iv. 11), and upon the four beasts mentioned in Ezekiel and in the Apocalypse. The apostles are supposed to rule; the prophets to declare the will of God; the evangelists to bring in converts; and the pastors to take care of them when brought into the Church. Their system is most elaborate and steel-bound; there is little room for freedom of movement amidst their ingenious proprieties. They have many orders in their hierarchy. Under the apostles are angels who are supposed to be bishops, and under the angels are elders. An angel properly has under him also prophets, evangelists and pastors, besides deacons who are in a lower order, and perhaps helps, deaconesses, under-deacons, and lay-assistants. It will be seen that most of the members must be office-bearers of some grade or other. They are supported by tithes which are paid with great regularity, and of which the control is strictly kept in the hands of the apostle.¹ They have a prayer-book of their own and a peculiar calendar of days to be observed.²

Irvingites are very quiet and dignified as regards their own tenets. Indeed, they are far too much so for the maintenance and propagation of what they hold to be truths of terribly important nature. As an instance of this reticence, they have refused, as I am informed, to give an account of their position in this series. Yet, if the destinies of the Catholic Church are greatly in their hands, and depend largely upon acceptance of what they hold to have been revealed to them, it is impossible not to see that they ought to take any opportunity of making known what is, as they think,

¹ Whitehouse v. Woodhouse.

² See my *History and Doctrines of Irvingism*, vol. ii., chap. i. Kegan Paul & Co.

of supreme importance to all people. Unless the candle is put upon the candlestick, how shall it give light to all that are in the house?

Under these circumstances, the secretary has applied to me, and has used such kindly pressure, that after declining as I thought once and again, I have consented to write upon this subject. But I must now act upon the stipulation which I made,—especially since advantage which I did not anticipate has been taken of former words of mine,—and state distinctly though briefly, why there is no sort of doubt in my mind that Irvingites have been the victims of a delusion.

1. In the first place, their system is grounded upon a method of interpretation of prophecy which has proved to be unsound. For their apostolate to have been real, our Lord ought to have come before 1855. He has not yet appeared; and perhaps those are right who suppose that the signs of His Advent may be withheld till the kingdoms of the world have been much more merged than they have been yet in the kingdom of God and of His Christ. But be this as it may—and we know not when He may arrive—according to Irvingite doctrine, pure and unalloyed, the apostles ought to have been on the earth in evident and acknowledged success to welcome His approach.

2. The strange vicissitudes of the history of the sect, the want of success, nay, the positive failure, the retirements of apostles, grand attempts ending in obscure life, prove by the test of events that the Divine Head was not specially there. Great things in various ways have been effected in religion during this century. There have been seen conspicuous earnestness, successful work amongst the poor and needy in the thickly crowded purlieus of cities, conversion of the heathen, a noble sacrifice of lives, martyrdoms, and a real grappling with evil glaringly rampant; and where in all these achievements has been the Irvingite banner or where any Irvingite heroes? When their claims have been so lofty, how is it that these claims have not been seen in noble operation? If their leadership is to be followed by all the Church, how is it that we have not desried in them the grand qualities with which leaders draw people to themselves?

3. But indeed their conceptions, grand as they are, have been grounded upon petty views of religion. They think that our Lord intended to have come again during the lifetime of St. Peter, St. James, St. John and their nine colleagues. How can they imagine that the wondrous Incarnation, with all its sacrifices, could have been undertaken by the Son of God, simply to save the contemporaries of the Apostles? Again, they supposed that our Lord was coming in a hurry at the beginning of this century, allowing time for only a few preparations to be made. For how few must they suppose that the salvation of mankind was intended! They blot out nearly eighteen centuries from the existence of the Church. They reck little of the growth of the Church, of the conversions, the endurance of persecutions, the noble martyrdoms, the earnest contentions for the faith. They are bound up in a world of their own, narrowed and becoming nar-

power, when around them religious hope is burning brighter and wider, and religious faith is becoming sounder and more inspiring.¹

Yet in some respects their tendencies have been just and good. Why do they not see that if they would follow them out to their lawful end, instead of cutting them short amidst narrow bounds, they would flock into the great Catholic Church, and strengthen that Branch of it which in their days has advanced so much in England, and has signs of so bright a prospect before her,—in times gone by the pattern of Unity to the State, at the present the example of Unity to Greater Britain, the Church of the land with her widening sympathies, and her communion even overlapping the Empire?

¹ For more information on all points, see my *History and Doctrine of Unitarianism*, 2 vols., Kegan Paul & Co., and some Articles in the *Church Times* in January and February, 1858, and some Articles in the *Church's Review* (London) by John Pusey, and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett.

THE UNITARIANS.

By HENRY W. CROSSKEY, LL.D., F.G.S.

(Minister of the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham; President of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 1891.)

It is my privilege to speak on behalf of a body of men upon whom it cannot be said that a very favourable judgment has been passed, either by the Churches of Christendom, or by the world at large.

By a large number of Christian Theologians, for many a long year, Unitarians have been condemned to "eternal perdition," *i.e.* (if the religious men who use such words realize their meaning) to share the very worst fate to which the most degraded of our race—scoundrels and liars, thieves and murderers—could by any possibility be doomed. When we have remonstrated, we have been met with a curt, sharp, decisive syllogism, derived from a verse in the Gospel of Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." "You do not believe. Those who do not believe cannot be saved; your souls must therefore be numbered among those that are 'lost.'"

This conclusion, we have been told, to our mingled amusement and amazement, is clearly deducible from "*the word of God*"; and its acceptance cannot be regarded as any sign of want of charity in man!

The shadow of this stern condemnation falls darkly over us throughout the whole confines of what is called technically "the religious world"—the world of divided and battling sects—a world which, in my judgment, often proves itself less generous-hearted than the world of poets and artists, men of science and novelists, philosophers and statesmen. In *this* "religious world" the Unitarians are very generally regarded with suspicion and distrust.

Among Christian sects we are the dangerous people. Religious communion with us is interdicted. Through the length and breadth of England there is scarcely a church or chapel—save it belong to the small group known as "Free Christian" or "Unitarian"—in which an avowed Unitarian would be permitted to preach, although he himself would willingly exchange pulpits with the most orthodox of orthodox believers. Books, bearing on their title-page the name of the "Unitarian Association," are practically placed on an *index expurgatorius*; and devices have to be employed to obtain a general circulation for them.

Men will sometimes come and listen to us in public halls, who will not

enter our churches—fearfully imagining, I suppose, that the germs of our pestilential heresies fill the air they would breathe in them, and haunt the cushions on which they would sit, so that they might “catch” Unitarianism, like small-pox or scarlet fever.

The Education Act, which excludes from Board Schools the teaching of creeds and catechisms “distinctive of any particular denomination,” is so interpreted by the majority of English School Boards as to mean that Unitarians are not a denomination entitled to any particular respect; and in schools supported by the rates, to which Unitarians as well as Trinitarians, Jews as well as Christians, may be compelled to send their children, the doctrines of Biblical Infallibility, the Fall of Man, the Atonement and the Trinity, are very commonly taught; and scholars sing hymns of glory to the “Bleeding Lamb” and the “Crucified” God!

Even when men throw off the popular creeds, and announce opinions which are as much entitled to be called “Unitarian” as a rose is to be called a rose—they will repudiate that name with indignation, as though it were shameful; and denounce us as narrow bigots should we venture to apply it to them.

Outside the ranks of the professed adherents of distinctive Churches a curious aversion to the Unitarians may sometimes be noted. We have, e.g., fallen under the lash of that great prophet of the nineteenth century, Thomas Carlyle. He meets a Unitarian minister, and admires him—“One of the sturdiest little fellows I have come across for many a day. A face like a rock; a voice like a howitzer; only his honest, kind grey eyes reassure you a little”; and after asking with amazement, in the spirit of the famous old question, “Can any good come out of Nazareth?”—“That hardy little fellow, what has he to do with *the dusthole of extinct Socinianism*?” Carlyle describes the Unitarians in no complimentary terms: “These people and their affairs,” he writes, “seem all melting rapidly enough into thaw slush, or one knows not what. Considerable madness is visible in them. ‘*Stare super antiquas vias!*’ No; they say we cannot stand, or walk, or do any good whatever there; by God’s blessing we will fly—will not you? Here goes!” And their FLIGHT!—it is as the flight of the *unwinged*; of oxen endeavouring to fly with the wings of an ox.”

Why do I speak of these things? As an appeal *ad misericordiam*? God forbid that I should speak of my RELIGION with bated breath and whispered humbleness!

A man has no firm faith in his religion, no solemn confidence that its Temple is upbuilt upon the Rock of Ages, when he can *apologise* for it.

I have noted the adverse judgments passed upon the faith I hold, because I believe that the unpopularity of a cause is a divine challenge for its careful study. The stone “rejected by the builders” is the very stone to be considerably and conscientiously examined, to see if it may not be fitted “to become the head stone of the corner.” Discarded prin-

ciples of thought and conduct make majestic demands of their own upon the hearts and souls of men, in the great might of the excessive wrong that may perchance have been done unto them. Not once or twice only, to find the world's heroes its prisons have had to be searched; not once or twice only has truth been found in those intellectual dungeons, heavily barred with iron prejudices, into which scorned heresies have been pitilessly thrust.

In this world's history, its "foolish things" have so often been chosen to "confound the wise"; and its "base things" and "things which are despised" have so often brought "to nought things that are," that the condemnation of any principle by the numerical majority of any generation is like the sound of silver trumpets heralding the presence of a Power, on behalf of which it may fairly be pleaded that there is at least sufficient chance of its possessing truthful authority to justify the lover of righteousness in entering upon a calm and thorough study of its claims.

In this spirit, although condemned as a heretic by every one of the great Churches, whose thoughtful and devout representatives have stood before you, I ask your kindly and generous consideration for the religion commonly known in this country as the religion of the Unitarians.

One further word I am bound to say by way of prelude. Every Unitarian speaks for himself and for himself alone. I am the mouthpiece of no organization; I cannot be "brought to book" by any authority on earth for any word I utter, however wild and foolish it may be. I am no more amenable to a "Unitarian Association" than I am to a presbytery or a general assembly, a lord bishop or a court of arches, a general council of Christendom or a pope.

Although born and bred, trained and educated among Unitarians; and a minister in the churches they frequent during my whole period of active life, I have never signed with my hand, or professed with my lips, a dogmatic "Unitarian Creed." The principles of my Unitarianism forbid me—for reasons which will presently appear—to sign a "Unitarian Creed" as peremptorily as they would forbid me to subscribe to the "Westminster Confession of Faith," or the "Thirty-nine Articles," even should I personally believe every doctrine those documents enunciate. In this I do not stand by myself; no Unitarian can speak authoritatively for any other Unitarian. The Unitarians are not like an organized regiment of soldiers, keeping step with each other in the ranks, and promptly obedient to their commanding officers; they are simply and solely a band of independent men, who are bound together, as friends are linked to friends, by certain broad and deep, although unwritten and unenforced, sympathies, ends, and aims.

All, therefore, I can do is to present statements for which I alone am responsible. Since, however, I have held from childhood to manhood continuous and intimate religious fellowship with those who are commonly called "Unitarians," *this much* may be fairly concluded, viz., that a man

holding such convictions as are mine has his place openly acknowledged among them, and may find a spiritual home within the churches in which they worship.

To this extent—but simply and solely to this extent—without any egotistical assumption, I may claim to be their representative. Should any Unitarian question what I say and declare that my thoughts are not his thoughts, I reply, "I worship where you worship, and no man has forbidden or can forbid me."

At the outset, there is one striking characteristic of the Unitarians that must be made especially clear and firmly emphasized, or our whole position will be misunderstood.

The body of men called "Unitarians" hold that no series of dogmatic articles of faith, no "creed," ought to be imposed upon the ministers or members of a "church" as a condition of religious fellowship; in other words, that a church ought to be kept as freely open for the pursuit of religious truth as a college is for the advancement of learning.

The name "Unitarian" is applied to men who hold, *as individuals*, certain opinions; but it does not adequately describe the constitution of the churches in which they worship. Our churches, with very few exceptions, *have free and open trusts*; they are dedicated, *i.e.*, to religious purposes, but no special form of theological opinion is made legally binding upon their ministers or members.

Personally, I happen to be a Unitarian; but I am the minister of a "church" in which no subscription to any specific articles of theological belief is either required from the congregation or involved in my own position. The ministers who preceded me held many opinions which are not mine; they frankly and freely taught them. The ministers who will follow me will, without doubt, not teach altogether as I teach; and no legal restrictions will close their lips. The living men and women of each day and generation are at absolute liberty to worship God according to their consciences, without being compelled by any Trust Deed to forsake the churches their fathers built.

The term "Unitarian Church" somewhat hides from the light of day this great fact. In the irony of fate, a body of men who place less stress upon dogma than any other body of men in the world, have yet been christened with a dogmatic name. Strictly speaking, what is popularly known as a "Unitarian Church" is a church in which "Unitarians" can and do meet for worship, but in which no legal obligations exist to check or forbid the free pursuit of truth. Our history illustrates our principle.

The Act of Uniformity (1662) rendered it imperative upon every clergyman to declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer; incapacitated every person from holding a benefice or administering the Lord's Supper who had not previously received episcopal ordination; and prohibited any one from preaching or conducting public worship unless he

did it according to the rites of the Church of England. Two thousand ministers flung up their benefices and went out into the wilderness of poverty, and endured patiently public scorn, rather than live in ease as slaves. Commanded not to preach, they preached. Churches were built for them by their immediate followers, and the law was most justly, most nobly, and most gloriously defied; not without pains and penalties, imprisonment and bonds.

The life of those churches these brave men refused to shackle with the chains of any creed. Sufferers for conscience' sake, they resolved that their children and their children's children should be free. Devoutly orthodox in creed themselves, they yet entrusted the charge of that they deemed the truth of God to the unfettered mind of man.

These men were our fathers; in the churches they and their friends and followers built, we worship. Gradually, generation by generation, the freedom they bequeathed was exercised; under its high warrant other opinions than theirs found a rightful home in their Houses of Prayer—Trinitarianism passed into Arianism, and Arianism into Unitarianism. Discussion undoubtedly attended these changes of thought; but on the whole they were effected with wonderful forbearance and kindness; and when it appeared that it was possible to raise actions in the law courts for the purpose of depriving those holding Unitarian opinions of the property inherited from their fathers, an Act of Parliament was promptly passed to prevent what it was acknowledged by statesmen of all parties—by Sir R. Peel and by Lord Macaulay—would be a grave injustice.

It is not for us—the living men of to-day—to say to the great tidal waves of human thought, “Thus far shall ye come and no farther.” If *our* children can find a better religion, the temples in which their fathers worship to-day shall still be theirs.

As our Trust Deeds are free, so is membership of our churches. If any living soul find in our services aught to strengthen him against temptation—to uplift his aspirations, to fill him with noble ardour to serve his fellow-men—he is welcome. He is put through no theological examination either of a heretical or orthodox type; be he saint or sinner, we dare not shut in his face the doors of the temple of our God! I am not unfrequently asked how we manage to prevent those with whom we may have no sympathy from coming and taking possession of our churches. Simply by not attempting to “manage” the matter at all; by excluding no one, we fling ourselves upon the hearts and consciences of men, in confidence that the more thoroughly human hearts and consciences are trusted, the more completely will trust be justified.

As with our Trust Deeds and our church membership, so it is with our ministry. The college in which a large proportion of our students are educated has for its motto these words: “The College adheres to its original principle of freely imparting Theological knowledge, without insisting on the adoption of particular Theological doctrines.”

As for our ministers, lengthened experience gives me some slight right to speak. Thank God ! this hand has never been compelled to sign itself a "slave !" From the first day on which I entered a pulpit until now I have remained as personally unpledged in teaching religion as any professor in a college chair of Art, Literature, or Science. Thank God ! I am minister of a church which declines to close its doors with the bolts and bars of theological articles upon any child of God who chooses to come and worship therein ! Neither have we established a central organization with authority to interfere with the independent action of any church. The "British and Foreign Unitarian Association" is simply an association of individuals interested in its purposes ; and it has neither power, nor do its managers show any inclination, to control the affairs of our congregations.

The spiritual freedom of every assembly of men, gathered for the worship of Almighty God—this is our first principle. The grounds upon which this principle is defended are not far to seek. We cannot presume to think that we possess the whole truth and nothing but the truth ; and dare not, therefore, dictate a creed either to our comrades in the pilgrimage of life, or to our posterity. Were we to draw up for an astronomer XXXIX. or CCCXXXIX. Articles of Astronomical Faith, and ask him to sign them, and to promise to teach those articles only, and to admit to his class only those students who would accept them ; would not his reply be an indignant refusal ? Would he not exclaim, "Who am I that I should declare no wonderful discovery can be made ? What is man that he can dream that he has probed the infinite depths of the awful heaven, clad with the loveliness of a thousand stars ?" Would not a teacher of Chemistry, of Physics, or of Philosophy, give the same refusal to any kindred demand ? Yet it would, I submit, be far more rational to say we know everything that *can* be known, or at least all that is necessary to know regarding Astronomy, Chemistry, Physics, or Philosophy—to frame a settled and changeless creed upon these subjects ; and to insist that there shall be no professor and no student at our colleges who will not sign it, than it is to say, "We have drawn up articles of faith about Christ and the Eternal God ; and none shall be our ministers, and none shall have fellowship with us, as members of our churches, who will not subscribe to them !"

No creed within the scope of the wit of man to devise can permanently secure uniformity of belief. Human words are susceptible of a hundred meanings—even when employed by acutest lawyers in Acts of Parliament—still more completely do they fail to convey one distinct thought and one distinct thought only, when used for the purpose of defining the infinite truth of God. A coach-and-four may be driven through an Act of Parliament ; but a little child can ask a question which will bring to confusion the meaning of the strictest creed.

We trust the truth of God ; surely whatsoever be His truth, He will protect. Were we to build a glass roof over an oak tree, and carefully

guard it from the weather, and, fearful lest it should fall, prop it up with stone buttresses, we should kill it for our pains. Exposure to the air and the storm strengthens it ; its leaves are greener as they drink in freely the breath of heaven ; its mighty trunk stands more firmly when kind nature is relied upon for its sustenance and support. "Whatsoever is of the truth" needs likewise no artificial protection ; its roots strike deep down into the heart of man, and all the powers of heaven and earth are pledged to its protection. The union established by natural sympathies is, we believe, stronger, more enduring, and sweeter than that achieved by the enforcement of an agreement to one creed.

Worshipping together, certain convictions (of which I have immediately to speak) have grown up amongst us ; but because we absolutely trust the truth, and are persuaded that "the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of His Holy Word," we refuse to convert them into fetters by formulating them into creeds.

I do not for one moment venture to say that the Unitarians have always been faithful in their allegiance to the great principle I am stating and defending ; but I maintain that a few passing inconsistencies cannot shake the fact that the love of Religious Liberty underlies their whole history, and that in this day and generation it is so intensely cherished that it would be as possible for the uplifted arm of man to turn back the sun in the sky, as for any section amongst them to secure the establishment of even the shadow of a dogmatic creed for the churches in which they worship.

All Unitarians certainly regard and respect the churches they frequent as places of worship. To do otherwise would be as great a perversion as to employ a Literary Society, or a Scientific College, for theological purposes. A church is a religious institution, and the freedom of a church is necessarily freedom within the limits of religious thought.

As the natural and inevitable result of their freedom, broad and striking differences of opinion exist among the Unitarians, differences indeed which would scarcely be tolerated ; or, if silently tolerated, would receive no public and avowed sanction, among any other body of men in this country united for religious purposes.

For example : Some Unitarians believe that Jesus Christ wrought miracles ; others reject as legendary those parts of the Bible which record such "wonderful works," and yet claim to be "Christians" ; some pray to their God "through Christ" ; others humbly seek direct access to the spirit of their Heavenly Father, and in the most solemn moments of their lives would be "alone with the Alone ; some call themselves "Christian Theists," or simply "Theists ;" others cherish a firm faith that a special and peculiar revelation of the will of God was made through an accredited and supernaturally endowed "Messiah."

But no ecclesiastical machinery exists among Unitarians, by means of which any man can be excluded from church membership because his intellectual convictions differ from those held by his fellow-worshippers.

In spite, however, of widely prevailing divergences of thought, certain distinctive and fundamental religious principles have won acceptance, or, at least, have found a refuge and a home among the worshippers in the Free Churches of England, principles to which the name "Unitarian" is in common speech applied. What these are I will attempt briefly and clearly to describe; but it is necessary to premise that *the Unitarians are characterized by the method they employ to gain religious truth more emphatically than by any system of doctrines whatever.* To discover religious truth they turn to Science and Humanity.

In the fixed and determined laws in changeless action among sun, moon, and stars; within our own minds and hearts and consciences, and in the conditions imposed upon their growth; in the course of history, in which events are overruled for the accomplishment of purposes unintended and unimagined by the actors in its dramas, we meet the will which is not *our* will, the authority which is not *our* authority, and have revealed to us what is the pleasure and the determination, and to that extent what is the character of the Supreme Power of powers. Man's decrees have not determined the methods by which this earth, the worlds around, and his own race have come into existence, or established the laws in accordance with which they are actually governed. Every scientific fact must therefore be accepted implicitly as a Divine truth, and conversely any "creed concerning God which contradicts a single scientific fact must necessarily be untrue.

The unflinching constancy of natural laws, with the resulting harmony of the worlds, is more wonderful than the most wonderful of miracles ever recorded. It is more than amazing to note that an established law never fails. North and south and east and west; at the bottom of the ocean; in the depths of the sky; in the unfrequented desert; in the recesses of pathless woods; among weeds and flowers; in the pool of water which is as a universe to myriads of unseen creatures—no spot can be found in which the laws of nature, which are to us the laws of God, lose their hold or fail in their persistency. More wondrous still is the law of duty to which a good man subjects all appetites, desires, tempers, and inclinations.

When in the character of a man conscience and affection are at one, the warm heart yielding its love to no object the conscience does not approve; when personal purity is united to mercifulness, sin being hated while all the influences of bad education, sordid surroundings, inherited tendencies receive due allowance in passing judgment upon the sinner; when enthusiasm, bright, hopeful, keen and eager, is wedded to farseeing and calculating wisdom; when unyielding courage, the courage of the man who can sail on any sea and land on any shore, fearless of any known or unknown foe, is tempered by the gentleness far readier to suffer than inflict pain; when resolute and determined endeavour to win from *this* earth and this life their choicest gifts, is blended with enduring patience; when the love of God and the love of man are as one emotion, inextricably intertwined,

so that no service is offered to the Lord in heaven, which is not also a service to man on earth—there is a harmony of character sublimer far than the ordered harmony of this outward universe—the music of the spheres. The awful Power of powers, men reverently name God, cannot—it is our conviction—be *less* worthy than the noblest man. As Thomas Carlyle writes: "All that is good, generous, wise, right, whatever I deliberately and for ever love in others and myself, who or what could by any possibility have given it to me, but *one* who first *had* it to give. This is not logic, it is axiom. Logic to and fro beats against this, like an idle wind on an adamantine rock."

We worship the God of *Life*—not an almighty theologian, chiefly interested in "Articles of Faith" and calling men to heaven or dooming them to hell according to the correctness or incorrectness of their opinions touching His Infinite Being. The Lord God Almighty is the Creator of the Man of Science, the Philosopher, the Historian, the Wit and Humorist, the Novelist, the Dramatist, the Poet, and the Artist. The God and Father of Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph, is also the God and Father of Shakespeare and Galileo, Milton and Wordsworth, Michael Angelo and Beethoven. In a great library we stand in a temple of God, sublimer than is the temple of which the earth is the pavement and the star-clad sky the over-arching roof.

"To gain religious truth from nature and humanity, the Unitarians maintain that they must use and trust the natural faculties they possess. They assert the right of the human intellect to reject what is unreasonable; the right of the human heart to reject what is unlovable; the right of the human conscience to reject what it condemns as evil, in any and every "creed" presented for their acceptance. A man who cultivates his rational powers and uses them faithfully—although he may form mistaken conclusions, does all that his Maker can expect from him with respect to his creed, inasmuch as he does his best with the faculties bestowed upon him. It would be utterly unjust in a Supreme God, to enable us to think—and then *because we think* to condemn us. We have affections which bind us together by the sweetest and tenderest ties and render us capable of sacrificing all earthly treasures for love's dear sake—when any creed, therefore, attributes cruelty to the Creator of the heart of man, we cannot receive it. "Or what man is there of you"—asks Jesus Christ—"whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?" This principle makes short work of many a fierce dogma. Would a father torment a child for ever? Impossible, must be the reply. Then we conclude at once that the doctrine of Eternal Punishment must be false. By our consciences we mark the distinction between good and evil. It is true that what one man esteems good another may pronounce evil, just as what is a rational conclusion to one man may be a perverse superstition to another. What we believe every one is bound to do is—to

obey his own conscience, and not to attribute to his God any actions which he would condemn as wicked among men.

I read in the First Book of Samuel that the "Lord of Hosts" spake through His mouth these words to Saul : " I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not ; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass"—and that He was angry because this terrific commandment was not executed to the last drop of blood. I do *not* believe that such a command was ever issued by the Lord of Hosts. Why? Because my conscience declares that promiscuous slaughter in war is a great wickedness. Suppose General Moltke, when he led the German army through France, had ruthlessly put to death man, woman, and child, together with all cattle of the field—the world would have stood aghast with horror. I dare not ascribe to the God of humanity a deed my conscience starts from with horror, as infamous among men.

The Unitarians at the present day, with possibly a few individual exceptions only, apply these tests to all the books of the Bible ; and ask : Are their teachings reasonable? are they humane? do they accord with the dictates of conscience?

Science, with no uncertain voice, declares that the world was not made in six days ; that the serpent went upon the ground long before man's appearance ; that death came into the world before a sin was committed ; that weeds are no sign of a ruined soil ; that a flood of waters never covered all the earth at one time ; that madness is not caused by the entry of " devils " into the soul. Such statements as these, therefore, are not believed, although they are written in the pages of the Bible. Using our ordinary sense of the distinction between right and wrong, we find in the Bible more than one code of morality. In its earlier books polygamy and revenge are sanctioned ; while " witchcraft " and the doing of work on the Sabbath are pronounced to be crimes worthy of death. The " Sermon on the Mount " sets aside what " was said by them of old time " with no uncertain emphasis. The rough and barbarous warrior's code of duty, which guided Joshua in his relentless wars, does not correspond with the teachings of the great Master of Nazareth, the spirit of whose religion finds voice in the angel-song which is said to have rung through the sky at His birth—" On earth peace, good will among men."

The desponding scepticism of the Book of Ecclesiastes—perhaps the most thoroughly sceptical book ever written—does not harmonize in the practical duties it inculcates either with the majestic prophecy of Isaiah : " As the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth, so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations ; " or with the wondrous injunction to toil divinely, conveyed in the words " As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

We feel bound therefore to use our best judgments in order that we may discriminate between the antagonistic views of life and duty contained in the Bible itself.

I can hardly express the fulness of my thankfulness that my religion justifies this application of rational methods to the study of the Bible. The Book of Genesis touches me infinitely more deeply with its childlike faith—its pastoral beauty—its patriarchal simplicity—because I do not attempt to make Moses speak the language of Lyell and Darwin; and do not judge Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the standard of modern civilization.

The Psalms have infinitely greater power to make me lie down in green pastures and to lead me beside the still waters, than they could have, did I feel bound to regard the wild curses uttered by David against his enemies as the very "word of God" Himself.

The Prophets become mightier guides when I study them as men Israel and Judah striving to direct the politics of their day by the eternal laws of righteousness, than they could possibly be to me were I to regard them as mere predictors of the fate of a few cities and the results of a few wars.

The Gospels and Epistles are the richer in spiritual influence over my soul, because I believe that it is more certain that the "blessed" among men are the merciful, the peacemakers, and the pure in heart, than it is that Christ turned water into wine; and that the metaphysics of Paul do not stand so far above criticism as those sublime words, "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." In ceasing to be regarded as infallible, the Bible has become to me far more truly a Book of Life.

In connection with this search for religious truth, it must be carefully noted that a Unitarian separates critical questions, of which the cultured intellect alone can be the judge, from spiritual sanctities affecting the heart and the conscience. He maintains that many of the ordinary subjects of theological controversy have little or nothing to do with religion at all. For example, to a Unitarian such as I am, belief in a miracle is not a religious act. It depends simply and exclusively upon the evidence offered to prove that such an event really took place, evidence which requires the most careful scientific examination, and with which we have no right to mingle our faith or our prayers. A man having to decide whether on a particular occasion water were or were not turned into wine, would indeed fail in his intellectual duty if he permitted any theory concerning a "Messiah," or any hope of heavenly reward, to interfere with the strictness of his investigations and the clearness of his judgment. I am neither redeemed from sin nor guided in the way of holiness by any opinion I happen to hold regarding the authorship of any book of the Bible. My heart may be so conquered by the beauty of Christ's holiness, that the one question I may ask touching all my thoughts, feelings, and actions is,

"Would they be approved by Christ? should I be ashamed to stand in His presence?" And yet I may not think it historically proved that He walked upon the waves or arose from the grave. To me, as a Unitarian, religion is solely concerned with the soul's attitude towards God—its hopes and aspirations, its penitence for sin, its struggles towards its high calling, its loving trust, its desires for the establishment of a kingdom of righteousness.

Exercising their spiritual freedom, and seeking truth by the method now indicated, those called Unitarians have (as I have previously stated) arrived at a general agreement respecting a few great religious principles, although, so far from employing them as theological tests for church membership, they have never even reduced them into any fixed and final shape as *doctrinal formula*.

The Unitarians are believers in one God. They are not so presumptuous as to imagine that they can define the Infinite; but facts, which come fairly within the scope of human knowledge, appear to them to establish the existence of One Spirit, One Power, One Life, pervading, sustaining, guiding all that is.

Every form of energy can be converted into some other form of energy. Stars are linked to stars, and systems of worlds to systems of worlds; while the elements of which a myriad orbs are fashioned are the same as those to be found in the earth on which we dwell. Moving bodies on earth are directed by the same forces as the planets in their courses. The physical history of our globe cannot be studied apart from problems that involve the history of every star in the sky. As completely as the body is one, although it has many members, so is the universe one, although it contains millions of worlds. Organism is connected with organism; and the first creature crawling on the shore of the first sea is related by secret life-ties to the insect floating in this morning's sunbeam.

"Nature," writes Humboldt, "considered rationally—that is to say, submitted to the process of thought—is a unity in diversity of phenomena; a harmony, blending together all created things, however dissimilar in form and attributes; one great whole animated by the breath of life. The most important result of a rational inquiry into nature is, therefore, to establish the unity and harmony of this stupendous mass of force and matter, to determine with impartial justice what is due to the discoveries of the past and to those of the present, and to analyze the individual parts of natural phenomena, without succumbing beneath the weight of the whole. Thus and thus alone is it permitted to man, while mindful of the high destiny of his race, to comprehend nature, to lift the veil that shrouds her phenomena, and, as it were, submit the results of observation to the test of reason and intellect."

Throughout the ages one moral law has persistently been applied to the feelings, thoughts, and purposes of every individual man, as to communities and nations. Purity and lust, selfishness and self-sacrifice, cowardice and

heroism, justice and injustice, have brought forth the same fruit, each after its kind, from the beginning of time until now—in ancient Babylon and Egypt, as in modern England.

All the men and women existing upon earth belong to one family; share, that is, a common humanity. This phrase, "a common humanity," is neither vague, rhetorical, nor sentimental; it expresses a sublime fact. A man as a man, the wide world through, has distinguishing endowments. He can master circumstances as no other creature can. He can think, love, do his duty, sacrifice for others even to the death. The "civilized" gentleman of the drawing-room has passions which unite him to the barbarian; the barbarians we may despise have some of the feelings of gentlemen. The saint is linked (as only the saint himself knows) to the sinner; and the sinner has powers hidden within him which may uplift him to the communion of the saints.

The world in which man lives is intimately related to the constitution of his being—

"My voice proclaims
How exquisitely the individual mind
(And the progressive powers perhaps no less
Of the whole species) to the external world
Is fitted; and how exquisitely too
The external world is fitted to the mind,
And the creation (by no lower name
Can it be called) which they with blended might
Accomplish."

Faith in one God is the recognition and expression of this blending together—this dependence upon each other of all atoms and all worlds—in the physical universe; this union of man with man in a "common humanity;" and this intimate connection of man with nature.

The Unitarians believe that a noble life is the one supreme requirement of the God they worship.

What is a noble life? Not simply a life adorned by gracious culture; not simply a life rich in the sweet joys of refined tastes and personal affections; but a life spent in the unselfish service of man. The noblest man is the humblest servant of his fellow-creatures. He is as "a nerve o'er which do creep the else unfelt oppressions of this earth;" he is the unlooser of heavy burdens; he is the leader of forlorn hopes for truth and freedom and righteousness' sake; he is the friend of publicans and sinners; he is the bringer of glad tidings to those in the bonds of their lower passions; he is the teacher of the ignorant, the uplifter of the fallen, and the champion of those who have no helper. The world's iniquities and the world's miseries are heavy burdens on his soul; and he cannot endure to dwell in peace and ease and comfort while *they* remain unredeemed and unrelieved. Christianity to the majority of Unitarians is *not* an abstract system of doctrines about the essential nature of the infinite God and the rightful place of a "Messiah" in the hierarchy of created beings; but the religion that demands that they should put away

all evil from their doings, and press forward to the highest nobleness which can be attained by man. Many of them freely criticize the letter of the records of the life of Christ, and in no way consider themselves bound to accept every text as an oracle from heaven; but they turn to the Cross as the sign and symbol of the religion of the divine life, rendered perfect by the sacrifice of self in the loving service of man. To the Unitarian, nobleness of character outweighs in worth all other considerations whatever. A man may be a heathen, or a Jew, or a Christian; a Confucian, a Buddhist, a Mahometan, or what not; he may be a Catholic or a Protestant of any sect; he may be a sceptic and a doubter;—nay, he may more than question, he may declare that he sees no reason for believing, in any religion at all,—and yet, if he be an honest man, and strive to do his duty towards his fellow-creatures, he is, in the faith I cherish within my heart of hearts, an accepted saint of God. I no more believe that a just God will punish an honest man for an erroneous faith, or for the lack of any faith at all, than I believe that He will condemn me to perdition because in my unconscious ignorance when a flower is presented to me, I assign it to a wrong species; or when I have to examine a rock, I place it in a formation to which it does not belong. Wrong opinions, conscientiously formed, are not crimes.

I shall be asked how Unitarians propose to deal with men who are *not* noble; how they meet the awful problem of human guilt. I have but one answer to make; and that the very simplest and plainest of all possible answers. I can see no way to "save sinners," except by persuading them to go and sin no more. Save by obedience to the eternal laws of righteousness I know not how the human heart *can* be purified from its stains. A sick man can only hope for recovery, as he observes the conditions of healthfulness; so is it with the sick soul. Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap; and until he sows wheat he cannot garner wheat in his barns. As we believe "in fire that it will burn," in gravitation and electricity, in the flowing of the tides through the influence of sun and moon, in the warmth of the sun and the fragrance of flowers, so we believe in the ceaseless and unswerving activity of moral laws. No theological contrivance will avail, if we scatter chaff over a garden, to make it blossom with flowers; if we scamp our work and put in bad material, to render it strong and enduring; if we take poison, to protect us from death; neither will any theological contrivance avail to convert a sinner into a saint, unless he resolve to walk in the path of righteousness. We have no doctrine of "Atonement," therefore, to offer to the world in any shape or form save one—the Atonement for wrong-doing that can be made by nobler living. When Zaccheus the publican joyfully received Jesus Christ in his house, in order to relieve himself of the burden of guilt for any grinding down of the poor of which he might have been guilty, he cried: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if *I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore to him four-*

sold." What was the reply of Christ? "And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation" (yes! mark, "*salvation*") "come to this house." *This* is the kind of atonement we plead with men to make for their sins; the salvation our religion offers them is the salvation of an ennobled life.

In the religion of the Unitarians this World is regarded as a possible Kingdom of Heaven.

This Earth as it is, how much fairer is it than we have had eyes to see! how much richer is it in blessings than we have had grace to understand!

By some forms of religion itself, have men's eyes been blinded to the glorious loveliness spread around them; and their hearts hardened so that they have not felt the full, rich, sweetness of innocent human joys.

An old monkish legend runs to the following effect: In May, 1443, a company of priests at the time of the Council went to walk in a wood near Basle. There were prelates and doctors and monks of all colours, and they discussed theological subtleties; but suddenly, in the midst of their dogmatic arguments, they stopped short, and remained rooted to the earth, before a linden tree whereon a nightingale sat and exulted and sighed in the softest, tenderest melodies. "Come away!" cried a shocked monk, "it is a temptation of the devil." A temptation of the devil—to be charmed from theological subtleties by a nightingale's song! In the religion I humbly cherish, the nightingale's song tells me more of my Maker than do the subtleties of theologians.

I am taught by my religion that it is graceless ingratitude to neglect the beauties and glories of earth; and that we shall best prepare ourselves to receive any blessings that may be yet to come in the world unseen by heartily enjoying the world that is now seen.

In what is known as a "religious newspaper" I read the other day a report of a sermon by a popular and devout preacher in which the following tale was told: At a Gospel meeting a lady was in deep concern about her soul; and when pressed to believe "God's word about Christ" (as the preacher called it), replied, "I know that God won't save me to-day." The minister asked, "Why not? God's word says that whosoever believeth shall be saved, and now is the day of salvation." The lady replied, "Ah! but I know God won't save me to-day, because I have made up my mind to go to Mrs. —'s ball on Tuesday evening, and He won't save me, you know, unless I am willing to give up the ball." The minister urged that God wished her then and there to believe that "through Christ He could and would save her soul from hell." The lady replied, "What about the ball?" The minister said, "Come to Jesus just as you are, with the resolve to go to the ball, and leave that resolve to Him. God commands you just as you are, and where you are, to believe that out of love to you His only Son died on the Cross for your sins to save you from hell." The lady burst into tears and cried, "I believe." The minister said, "What about the ball?" She joyfully exclaimed through her tears, "Ah! I don't

want to go to the ball now; I have obtained something better—henceforth I shall live to return the love of Him who laid down His life for me.”

In one of the charming letters of the keenest satirist of modern days, letters which show that the tenderness of Thackeray's heart excelled even the quickness of his insight into human follies, Thackeray writes: “I don't know about the unseen world, the use of the seen world is the right thing, I'm sure. It is just as much God's world and creation as the kingdom of heaven with all its angels. How will you make yourself most happy in it? how, at least, secure the greatest amount of happiness compatible with your condition? By despairing to-day and looking up cloudward? *Pish*. Let us turn God's to-day to its best use as well as any other part of the time He gives us. . . . The bounties of our Father I believe to be countless and inexhaustible for most of us here in life; Love the greatest, Art (which is an exquisite, admiring sense of nature) the next. By Jove! I will admire, if I can, the wing of a cock-sparrow as much as the pinion of an archangel, and adore God the Father of the Earth, first; waiting for the completion of my senses and the fulfilment of His intention towards me afterwards, when this scene closes o'er us.”

I cannot perhaps describe more clearly the spirit of the religion I hold than by saying that it bids me cry “Amen” to the words of the great humorist, rather than to the injunctions of the preacher to “believe” a faith which will compel me to regard the going to a ball as a desertion of Christ.

The Unitarians accept with all their hearts and souls the sublime fact that the history of man is the history of a progressive being. The legend of “the Fall” has a strange and touching beauty of its own. It is like the sigh of an outworn and weary man for the days of his childhood, when he knew no sin and had received no wounds in the fierce battle of life. But we dismiss it from our religion. We believe in the rise and not the fall of man. We believe ourselves members of a race which has ever been pressing onwards, unfolding fresh powers, discovering new truths, recognising higher and more comprehensive duties, escaping from barbaric instincts and surroundings, and establishing from age to age, in some portion of the world or other, a more wisely ordered and happier civilization.

The commonest school-books teach how our rude forefathers passed in their knowledge of the world's resources from the “age of stone,” through the “age of bronze,” to the “age of iron.” When we study the history of nations we find that each empire did some service in the world, and only fell when that service was fully rendered and it encumbered the ground. The history of religion tells the same glorious tale: every religion has been in its day a step in advance. Practices and doctrines superstitious to us at our time, helped, as we acknowledge with gratitude, to uplift the souls of men. Every Christian Church, every form of faith, now to be found in the world, is, we believe, suited to the wants of some human

hearts, strengthens them to endure and toil and hope as they pass through this strange pilgrimage, and thus prepares in the desert a highway for our God.

Alas ! we are none of us true to our religion. *So far as the Unitarians are true to their faith* they stand in the ranks of the enthusiasts of humanity. This is their rightful place by virtue of their principles and their history, however poor and weak may be their organizations, however inconsistent may be their conduct, however timidly they may shrink from the logical consequences of their own convictions, however feebly they may discharge their duties. At least I may claim without boastfulness that they have to some real extent proved themselves among the enthusiasts of humanity by making their spiritual centres centres of beneficent activities. They taught reading, writing, and arithmetic in their *Sunday Schools*, when a knowledge of those simple arts was denied to the masses of our people. They conduct missions in which the wants of the suffering are heeded apart from any distinction of sect and party. They strive to unite themselves in the discharge of public duties with all men who are sufficiently liberal in spirit not to exclude heretics desirous of being useful in God's world from their company. And who is the enthusiast of humanity? Such an enthusiast as I am moved by all the power and authority of my religion, first and foremost of all things, to pray that I may become? The enthusiast of humanity especially rejoices in all the bravest, most loving, self-sacrificing deeds recorded in the history of man; although performed by few, they mark for him sublime possibilities for all the children of God, and are majestic prophecies of the world that is yet to be. His heart beats as he hears of the captain standing by the sinking ship until all are saved; the soldier carrying a wounded comrade from the battlefield amid a storm of bullets; the miner penetrating dark and dangerous shafts in which the air is charged with poison and flames to rescue his comrade; the surgeon tending the sick in the haunts of pestilence.

He reverences with a boundless reverence those who have had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment; who have been stoned, sawn asunder, tempted, slain with the sword, for righteousness' sake.

He enthrones as his masters, lords, and kings those who have been the world's outcasts, because the world's redeemers; who have opened the prison-house for the oppressed, and made the blind see and the deaf hear.

He watches and aids to his utmost power the work of those who would bring home the prodigal; drag the stained woman from haunts of debauchery; bring young children from the gutter to the school; and replace by angel presences of pure and holy feelings the demons of coarse passion which have entered into human souls.

The enthusiast of humanity learns from all that has been done by man never to despair, and his confident hope, justified by the lives of those who

have strived, toiled, and died for the ungodly, for the miserable, and for the wronged, is that

“A brighter morn awaits the human day,
 When every transfer of earth's natural gifts
 Shall be a commerce of good words and works;
 When
 The fear of infamy, disease, and woe,—
 War with its million horrors and fierce hell,—
 Shall live but in the memory of time,
 Who like a penitent libertine shall start,
 Look back, and shudder at his younger years.”

Whatsoever of this enthusiasm of humanity dwells within my heart I owe to the religion I have so imperfectly described to-day. I owe to my religion also the crowning hope that the awful and majestic Power of powers, who has called into being as His children those who can so majestically, although through such dire and terrible struggles, pass from glory to glory, will not cast away as worthless any individual soul belonging to the race He has so richly endowed with a capacity for endless growth, but has prepared a heaven “of many mansions,” where all tears shall be wiped away from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things shall have passed away.

THEISM.

BY THE REV. CHARLES VOYSEY, B.A.

I HAVE been courteously invited, as the minister of The Theistic Church in London, to set forth and explain the principles and beliefs of Theism. In order to enlist your sympathy with the subject at the outset, and to inform those of my hearers who know nothing about it what it is they are now asked to look at and to examine, I will as briefly as possible give a summary of the Theistic principles and beliefs.

The Leading Canon is : That it is the right and duty of every man to think for himself on matters of religion.

No other man, however illustrious ; no book, however venerable or precious ; no Church or sect, however ancient, dominant, or arrogant, may be used as an authority, binding in any degree upon the individual mind or conscience.

The Second Canon is : That while all professed knowledge of God is partial, defective, and comparatively very small, such knowledge may be increased, corrected, and refined by the proper use of our faculties ; and that as generations to come may successively advance in intelligence, enlightenment, and virtue, they will make progress likewise in the knowledge of God.

The Third Canon is : That all knowledge of God whatever must be based on natural facts—on certain indisputable facts in the outer and physical phenomena of Nature, and on certain indisputable facts in the nature and faculties of man ; on these latter as the interpreters of the former. Under this Canon, the corollary is drawn, that no belief of Theism can ever be at variance with the exact and demonstrated conclusions of true Science. Between true Science and true Theism there can be no collision.

These are the main principles of Theism, by which as a system of religious belief it must be always guided and controlled.

The beliefs are very simple and few :—

1. A belief in one only God, who is Supreme over all the universe in power, wisdom, and goodness.
2. A belief that everything is now ordered and working for the best, and that the final issue will be entirely good, to the satisfaction of every creature capable of sensation and thought.
3. A belief that as our having life at all here is the result of the love of God towards us, that life will be continued for ever in such other conditions as God may see to be best for us.

4 The belief in a God like this is no barren opinion or intellectual conviction, but a very powerful and constant stimulant to the highest virtue and to brotherly love among men. Whenever it takes hold on the heart, it gives patience and fortitude under the trials and perplexities of the world, it purifies all our pleasures, and fills us with a joyful hope.

Theism is, then, a belief in a God whom we can thoroughly trust and love, and whom to obey is a delight; a belief based on indisputable facts, and capable of expansion and elevation with every addition to our knowledge and with every rise in our moral nature.

You now have before you, I hope stated with clearness, the subject we have to consider.

First, a few words in reference to the name Theism. In some respects it is unfortunate, because it is only intelligible to persons who have a certain amount of education. It is not at once clear and definite to the ignorant, as the English equivalent "Belief in God" would have been; but I am not responsible for its adoption. I found the word already established in literature for the very ideas and beliefs which I had come to hold on quite independent grounds.

The earliest use of the term Theism which I have been able to discover, is in the works of Lord Bolingbroke, although he and kindred writers in his day were called "Deists" not Theists: a most fortunate fact for us, because our Theism differs from some of their Deism even more strikingly than the Deists differ from each other.

In the present century Francis William Newman was the first writer in England to give to the term "Theism" a definite and formal signification. He published an elaborate treatise in rhythmic prose under the title of *Theism, Doctrinal and Practical*, in 1858. Soon after, in 1863 or 1864, Miss Frances P. Cobbe issued her *Broken Lig'ns* in which we find the term Theism freely applied to the religious beliefs of which I am speaking. But some years before either of those two works appeared, I think in 1834, Theodore Parker had published in America his celebrated *Discourse of Religion*, in which he very often uses the term "Theism" in the same way, but not with such uniform and definite regularity, as did F. W. Newman. For "Theism," Parker sometimes used the terms, "The Absolute Religion," "Spiritualism," and even "Christianity." On the whole, then, I think Professor Newman is entitled to be regarded as the originator of the name Theism in its application to the principles and beliefs of The Theistic Church.

For my own part, I had no choice but to follow an example so worthy of reverence, and to adopt the title which was already recognised, stamped and current amongst educated persons. All the three writers I have mentioned,—Parker, Newman, and Miss Cobbe—alike repudiated the authority and infallibility of all so-called supernatural revelation; all alike regarded the knowledge of God as attainable only through the native faculties of man—Reason, Conscience, Love, and Religion.

It was necessary that the new teaching should be antagonistic : on one side to Christian dogmas, and on the other to Atheism, Pantheism, and Positivism.

Miss Cobbe is, perhaps, the most distinguished for her antagonism to the latter three forms of thought ; and while she attacked also the Christian dogmas, she stopped short of criticizing Jesus. Parker, in his *Discourse of Religion*, dealt fairly but severely with the errors of Jesus, yet occasionally neutralized his criticism by recurring to the sentimental talk fashionable among Unitarians, and even wrote a glowing hymn addressed to Jesus Himself.

Professor Newman stands pre-eminent among the three for his unsparing unequivocal opposition to the prevailing sentiment and idolatry, and he sees to this day the dire necessity for such an uncompromising attitude. I need hardly say that, although I do not concur with him in every detail of his criticism, I am heart and soul with him in the integrity of his principles on this matter of antagonism to the supremacy of Christ.

Theism, in this age and under present conditions, is, therefore, both positive and negative, constructive and destructive, practical and militant.

All the chief religions of the world are believed by their respective votaries to have been revealed authoritatively by God to men ; and the tales of such revelation and the subject-matter revealed are contained in so-called sacred books or in some mysterious way entrusted to an individual or to a Church, which, on that ground, claims absolute submission of mind and will, as to a God or living representative of God. Theists, on the other hand, declare that none of these alleged revelations can be Divine, because they contain ideas and beliefs which are contrary to the reason, or the conscience, or the affections, or the religious instinct of man, or to all four together, or to any of them in combination. The Theist will say to one and all the claimants : You appeal to my reason by every intelligible proposition you utter ; if it concerns a matter of ethics, you appeal to my conscience ; if a matter of beneficence or the contrary, you appeal to my native human love ; and if, on a matter of the Divine dealings, you appeal to my native religious instinct. Your revelation must appeal thus to my native faculties, or else it might as well be brought to me in a foreign language which I do not understand. I am absolutely bound by the necessity of things to use these faculties before I can understand even what you say. But some of you, Christians most of all, do your utmost to hamper and paralyze my faculties by bribes and threats, so that my power of perception is blurred, my judgment is biassed, and my discernment of truth from falsehood considerably weakened. You tell me that your revelation is the actual word of the God who made me, and it has a right to my prompt belief and obedience. You tell me, if I believe your message I shall have infinite and endless happiness, and that if I believe it not I shall be doomed to infinite and endless woe. Thus, while you apparently appeal to my God-given

faculties for distinguishing truth from error, you really are appealing to my selfish hopes or to my debasing fears. This process of itself arouses my suspicions and sets me on my guard; makes me more sceptical than ever—and therefore I at once, if I can, bring all my energies to look carefully at what you declare to be God's word and God's revelation to me. I bring to bear on this inquiry my native faculties. I ask, in turn—Is this rational? Is it probable? Is it credible? Does it tally with experience and with the known order of natural events? I then use my conscience, and I ask: Is this or that statement consistent with right? Would it be just? Ought I to trust, love, or obey the Being to whom such and such conduct is imputed? I go further, and ask my heart: Should I treat my children in this way? Would I demean myself to torment my fellow-man or do any wanton harm even to my enemy? Could I be so brutal to a dog or to a venomous reptile?

The Theist is essentially involved in such inquiries whenever any alleged Divine revelation is put before him, claiming his belief and submission. He tests every statement by an appeal to what is highest and best within himself. He cannot, of course, pretend to solve every problem and to explain every detail of the marvellous Cosmos, but it is always within his range and within his rights to submit all alleged revelation to the scrutiny of his reason, conscience, and noblest affections. And the answer hitherto given by the Theist, *e.g.*, to the Christian revelation by the Bible, by the Church, or by Christ, is this: I find some of your statements to be childish, irrational, and palpably untrue. I find other of your statements to be morally objectionable, ascribing to God dealings which our conscience condemns. Nothing can dislodge the Theist from his position or shake his conviction of the wisdom, righteousness, and goodwill of God, because that conviction is based on the facts of human nature, the nobler part of which consists, in its own small degree, of wisdom, righteousness, and goodwill or love. If there be a God at all, it is only common sense to say, He must be at least as good as the best of men. Logically, you *can* overthrow the Theist by denying God and proving that there is no God at all. But so long as this is unproved, so long as it is only doubtful whether there be a God or not, Theism stands absolutely secure.

That form of mere Agnosticism which says, "There may be a God, but we can never know anything about Him," is quite untenable while man retains his present faculties of reason, conscience, and affection. For to admit that there is a God, and yet to say He may be neither intelligent, nor righteous, nor loving, is to deny that there is a God, but to admit that there may be a devil or an idiot at the source of things. Such foolishness is too transparent.

Here, however, it is needful, even if it be somewhat out of the order of my argument, to say distinctly that the claim we Theists make to know by the world and by ourselves some little of the truth about God, is com-

bined with a most profound and reverent kind of Agnosticism which confesses that at best we can only know a very little, and that but partially and defectively as compared with the actual and full truth. It is in our power to say He must be as good as the best of His creatures ; it is not in our power to tell how infinitely better and higher He is. And this power of limited affirmation, enables us to discern whatever of truth and moral beauty may be found in all so-called revelations, and to accept heartily every word which may commend itself to our reason, conscience, and heart. This is why Theists have retained in their worship some of the old forms of the Christian Church, and use to great advantage many parts of the Bible, especially of the Psalms, and the Prophets, and the moral precepts of the New Testament. But you already know that we do not accept them on the score of any alleged supernatural authority ; only on the ground of their intrinsic truth and value. We do the same with the sacred books of other religions likewise. We never cease to proclaim that every man carries within him his own revelation, his own powers of seeing and knowing some truth about God, and that it is not only our right, but our paramount duty, to exercise our faculties in that search.

Now, let me simply state what we Theists believe concerning God, as taught us by those three faculties of Reason, Conscience, and Love. In the first place, Reason warns us that a knowledge of God as He is, and of the mode of His relation to the material world, is impossible. We do not even yet know what our own souls are, or how they are related to our bodies. But as we can discern the distinction between soul and body, we reasonably infer that there is an infinitely greater Soul than ours behind all the phenomena of the visible universe. Chance being no longer tolerated as an explanation of what we see, the only alternative is that which Science herself affirms, namely, that order, and law, and purpose mark every step in the course of what we call Nature. And if anywhere, even in a single instance, a true purpose can be seen, it is a proof of the existence of some Power corresponding to what we call "mind" in ourselves.

Every discovery which we can make of law or purpose involves the conception of a mind capable of originating and working it out. It is no answer to say that mind as we know it in ourselves is always found in conjunction with a living and healthy brain, and that therefore there is no such thing as a Divine Mind. For what is proved is not a mere postulate, but an accomplished fact. Here before our eyes is the result of mind or reason in the most stupendous form. The fact teaches us something we could not otherwise know ; viz., that mind is not necessarily dependent on a human brain, but does exist and work on a scale infinitely beyond our highest brain-power, and therefore is of necessity not dependent on brain as ours may be. Having got this proof of the Divine Intelligence, our reason tell us that God must be *true* ; that truth can only emanate from Him, and that only truth can, so to speak, please or satisfy His Mind. Thus we get the idea of His trustworthiness out of our reason alone. But

reason by itself is not sufficient ; for men equally wise and equally intent on searching for truth have arrived at opposite conclusions respecting the power or powers that rule in Nature. Some have insisted that there can only be one such power ; others that there are many, or at least two—one evil and one good. Science has helped us in this region of inquiry very much indeed, by discovering innumerable tokens of the absolute unity of the whole cosmos, and by teaching that, if there be a God at all, there can be only one. Polarity there may be, but no antagonism. Science sides rather with the text, " I the Lord create good, and I create evil," and not with the Persian belief in the eternal war between Ormuzd and Ahriman.

Reason by itself will not solve the great problems of good and evil, life and growth, decay and destruction, which are everywhere manifest. So we turn to another faculty of our nature in order to know more of Him whom we call God. We have within us the moral sense, the sense of duty, the absolutely pure feeling : " I ought to do this, I ought not to do the other, no matter what the consequences to myself may be. I ought to do what I think to be right. I ought to try with the utmost pains to find out what is right." This sense, for brevity, we call Conscience. It is often loosely confounded with moral codes, and put in place of the list of things we ought to do and ought not to do. These things the conscience does not tell us, they are taught by reason and experience and artificial education. The conscience is only the uniform voice telling us to do what we think or know to be right, because it is right, and not because we shall be rewarded ; and to avoid doing what we think or know to be wrong, because it is wrong, and not because we shall be punished.

This sense of right is always associated in a religious mind with the idea of God. When we say, " I ought," we really say, " I owe it to my Maker to do this," or, " I owe it to my fellow-man to do this, because duty is part of my obligation to the God who gave me life and powers, and put me into relation with other men."

Now, of course, it stands to reason, it is nothing more than plain common-sense to infer that the conscience could only have been implanted in man by a Being who was Himself good, and on the side of right and against wrong ; and who wanted to provide that men should act from a sense of duty to one another, and also from the best motives. For I should have noted before, that the conscience demands not only right action, but pure motives, and demands from us secret goodness as well as good behaviour.

A God who caused us to feel all this must be Himself righteous, utterly true and faithful and trustworthy, pure in His purposes, and steadfast in their fulfilment. We thus simply and reasonably reach the conception of a Good God.

I am not here to-day to answer every objection that could be brought against Theism, only to state what it is. Nevertheless it will occur to a hundred doubters to point at once to what goes on in the world, of pain

and moral evil, and ask how one can reconcile these things with a belief in a good God. You will own with me that the question is too vast to be entirely answered now ; but I affirm that we Theists have given a better answer to it than any which has been made by the other great religions of the world.

If that answer can be summarized at all, I will try to give it now :—

Pain and death are not evils in themselves. They are essential to the progress and happiness of all sentient creatures. Take away the possibility of pain, and there could be no more physical enjoyment.

Pain likewise ministers constantly to the well-being and improvement of the outward lot of man, and still more to the elevation and progress of his nobler faculties. Without pain, some of our highest virtues would be unknown and impossible. As for death, if there were no such thing as dying, the world would become indeed a hell. When it is also believed that death, for man at least, is only the passage into a higher state of life, death is no longer considered as an evil at all. Moral evil is also a blessing in disguise ; for it is produced *not* by any acts which we now call wicked, but by having a conscience which makes us see that when we do such and such acts they are wicked and wrong. Moral evil is the result not of a fall from perfection, but of a rise from sheer animalism and brutal unconsciousness of right and wrong. Moral evil is also the chief factor of our highest virtues in dealing with it.

I grant you, if death makes an end of us, this moral discipline is frustrated ; but if we are to live for ever, our moral discipline here will have its fruition hereafter, and all souls will come to be righteous and fulfil the evident purpose for which they were created.

I fear—nay, I know—how fragmentary and perhaps useless this answer may be. All I can say is, that we have devoted more attention to these subjects of pain and sin because they are the chief obstacles to a belief in a good God, and we have been rewarded for patient research by seeing in these very so-called evils the greatest tokens of His faithful goodness. The Atheist can only howl at them as the cursed conditions of a godless world. The Christian makes of creation a blunder, infinite and inexcusable, and a God defeated by a devil, while He stands by hopelessly helpless and sees the millions of lost souls streaming into endless hell. The Theist sees all things in the light of steps upward into light and glory and goodness and blessedness, marks of Divine wisdom and Divine power, Divine patience, and Divine love. Anyway, the conscience tells us that God must be good, and will make all things come right at last, even if there is much that we cannot explain. If everything we call evil is not to issue in good, then man is more righteous than his Maker.

The conscience in man demands as well as expects that the course and destiny of the world should, before all things, be right.

But Reason and Conscience do not stand alone in our nature. They teach us much, yet there is more to learn ; and a still higher teacher is

within us. This is Love, which, thank God, every one knows something of by experience. In spite of all the inferior and even foul meanings which have been given to the term, it is known as the impulse to do good, and only good, and the highest good, to its object. It is an emotion distinct from the Reason and Conscience, yet whenever it is true Love it acts in harmony with both.

Its presence in the heart is a source of joy, its exercise is an ecstasy, our highest bliss on earth, and the success of its endeavours the richest reward. It is absolutely unselfish, every self-denial for love is so much gain; every sacrifice, even to life itself, is an indulgence of supreme desire. True love is the only perfect and infallible faculty which belongs to us, and nothing raises and ennoble us so much, or wins for us the homage of mankind. We know how it surpasses the achievements of the grandest genius, the most perfect skill, the greatest efforts of intellect. We know, too, how true love excels even the rarest conscientiousness, and how far nobler it is to be impelled by love than by a cold sense of duty.

We need not be told that if true love ruled all our actions, and was the motive of all our lives, all sin would disappear, and a multitude of sorrows would be heard of no more. We see, day by day, how love is destroying, one by one, the enemies of human happiness, and how it takes away the sting of those troubles which we have not yet learned to extirpate. Love is evidently bestowed upon us in order to arm us against the foes of pain and sin, which we have to fight. Love is the mighty conqueror of the world's evil. God has put love into our hearts in order that we may do our duty to each other, that every one shall have, not only his rights, but a wealth of happiness into the bargain; that envy, and jealousy, and strife, shall cease; that we may live for each other, and not for ourselves. He has given us love in order that the fulfilment of our natural duties may be a delight to us; that we may choose duty freely, and not be driven to it like slaves; that in the most pure and unselfish devotion to others we may find our highest happiness. We all know more or less of this love, which we may well call Divine, because it is so supreme over all else that is human. And shall we be so blind, so silly, as to suppose that our Maker is lacking in this—the noblest quality of our nature? While we attribute to Him intelligence by proof of our reason, and righteousness by the testimony of our conscience, shall we doubt that He has love—which even we poor worms of the earth feel and enjoy? If God have no love, then indeed is He sunk below the level of man; and the vastness of His cosmos, and the order and beauty of it all count for nothing beside the love which flows from the human heart. The idea is too absurd to dwell upon. If there be a God, He must be infinitely more loving to us than a mother to her babe, and will always seek our good and only good, and our highest good; and to Him the exercise of His Fatherly love must ever be the unspeakable joy in which He lives and reigns.

Thus is the Theist taught by what is best in himself to think more

grandly and nobly of God than has been hitherto taught by any other religion in the world save one. That one is the Theism which we find embedded in some of the writings of the Hebrew Psalmists and Prophets, who, protesting against the Levitical and popular creeds of their day, as we protest against the Christian and popular creeds of our own, discovered for themselves these simple and sublime truths about God by the exercise of their own native faculties. And if we go through the world, we shall find the same beautiful truths everywhere revealed to men, nominally of all creeds, who have surrendered themselves to the guidance of Reason, Conscience, and Love within them. Theism, then, is a belief in a wise, righteous, and loving Father, in whose wisdom, righteousness, and everlasting love we can entirely trust with an absolute certainty that all the past, present, and future are working out issues that shall be only good—good for all, and good for each; good for every soul which He has begotten: so that there will come a time when every creature endowed with consciousness, memory, and aspiration shall be satisfied and give Him thanks for all that they have been, and for all that they are. This is a belief against which no human heart can recoil. Every man would wish it to be true: only the whisper of doubt and fear mutters, "It is too good to be true." The Theist says, "Nothing is too good to be true." Man, at his best, cannot rise so high as the height to which God's greater love will hereafter carry him.

And now I ask you to turn and look at the natural and reasonable consequences of such a belief. First, it draws our hearts towards God in trust and love. We are made patient by it, and willing to hear what happens, because it is of God's sending. If it be conquerable, we do our utmost to get rid of it, seeing it is God's will that we should resist it. All trouble is given to us to fight with and to reduce to its lowest power of injury. Only when we see the trouble to be incurable and inevitable, then we must bear it patiently and manfully. But whatever it be, we see that it is sent in love, and is designed to do us good, and is sure to do us good and be the best for us in the end. Thus we conquer all the troubles and ills of life through trusting in a righteous and loving God. More important still is the fact that knowing God to be to us all a loving Father, our hearts are drawn towards Him in filial affection and earnest desire to do only what He wishes us to do, and forsake all that we feel to be wrong. This trust in and love of God therefore ensures our faithful duty to each other, and we try to cultivate both conscientiousness and brotherly love. By our love to God we are stirred up to desire intensely purity of heart and motives, to be true and good where no eye can see, no human voice applaud, no human judgment condemn. The man who prays to God to give him a clean heart and a right spirit is far more likely to serve well as a man and a brother than he who has no such desires at all.

Again, the love of God as a Father teaches that we are *all* brethren, and that all alike are His dear children, those we call the bad as well as those

we call the good, and therefore we must be, like Him, loving unto all and turn our backs on none. All will have to be cured of their evil at last. And so this teaches the true nature of the Divine punishments. No sin is ever passed over with impunity, but strictly meets with its due penalty—never for vengeance, but always for correction and cleansing. The true Theist is the last man to say or to feel that because all men are safe in God's hands, therefore we may do as we like and sin with impunity. We say God's punishment is never to be evaded, as it is said to be, by atonement and the Christian scheme of salvation. We make our own roads of woe or bliss longer or shorter, more painful or more blissful, by every thought, word, or deed. But Theism gives what God has given a right to all to have and to enjoy—undying hope of being cleansed and made righteous and loving at the last. Some day in God's good time His work will be perfected in us all.

It is fitting that I should bring these remarks to a close by stating the grounds on which the Theist believes in immortality. We pass by all the commonplaces of ground for the hope to which so many cling, such as the universal aspiration for life after death and the tender affections which are so grievously wounded by the separation from those we love. We pass by also the ridiculous nonsense about "the resurrection of the body through our Lord Jesus Christ." Our sole ground of hope that we cannot die is in the Fatherly love of God towards us all. If He loves us, He will never consent to part with us. If He will part with us, if He wants us no more, He cannot love us, and there is an end of our love and trust. I might reverently say, an end to Him, too, for man's heart can only love a loving God. This is enough on which to base the hope of immortality—simply the love of God towards us, as great as, nay, infinitely greater than, our love to each other. It is a hope only, because we have not been behind the veil of mortal death. But it is a hope amounting to a certainty, for it is a definite corollary from our belief in God Himself. It is also a hope without any anxiety or necessity to know any of the conditions of that future life. We trust God's love so entirely and with such perfect peace that we do not want to know beforehand anything which He is not willing to tell us. Whatever it be, it will be the best for us; and what His wisdom and love devise is sure to satisfy us. But we *must have it*. We must live again, unless there be no God to love and to live for, in which case, speaking for myself, I would rather not try so dangerous an experiment. I would prefer to be extinguished.

I hope I have not taxed your patience too severely. My object will have been attained if you go away with a clear idea that Theists believe in one (absolutely undefined, non-material) Being who, in our poor language, is the Author of our lives and the Father of our souls—so wise, so capable, so righteous, and so loving that all the sons of men may put their trust in Him without one spark of doubt or fear; that He is known to us as this trustworthy loving God by the highest faculties of our own nature,

which, as Father, He has transmitted to us in order that we might know sufficient of what He is, and so come to love Him, and willingly out of love fulfil our duties to each other, and love them with a pure heart fervently.

This belief—a practical religion and not a mere intellectual conception—will alone enable us to explain the great problems of life and help us to bear its troubles, while it ennobles all our pleasures and heightens all our joys, gives patience and fortitude in life, and sweet peace and brightest hope in the hour of death. It is a Gospel worthy of the song of angels and archangels :—

“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward man.”

MYSTICISM.¹

By W. S. LILLY.

I PROPOSE in this article to tell you a little about Mysticism. Many people in the world, perhaps most, would regard this as equivalent to an announcement that I am going to talk nonsense. Mr. Carlyle has somewhere remarked that when a man speaks to us about a matter which is foreign to our usual thoughts, we are apt, in self-defence as it were, to label him a mystic, by which we mean privately—even if we are too polite to say so openly—a dunce. Should there be any here who, at the outset, are inclined to regard me with this sort of suspicion, let me beg of them to be patient awhile. I shall hope to show them before I have done that Mysticism, so far from being nonsense, is the highest and best sense.

Now, we English like to go by the facts. To do so, we are assured on all hands, is the one path of safety. I am not disposed to deny that; only I claim to take in all the facts, and not one class only arbitrarily selected. Let us go by experience by all means. But we must take *the totality* of experience. Let us consider, then, a little the facts of life—of everyday life—as we all lead it. I remember some verses of Matthew Arnold—they come from his very beautiful poem *Rugby Chapel*—which give a striking picture of that everyday life:—

“What is the course of the life
Of mortal men on the earth?
Most men eddy about
Here and there—eat and drink,
Chatter and love and hate,
Gather and squander, are raised
Aloft, are hurled in the dust,
Striving blindly, achieving
Nothing; and then they die—
Perish! and no one asks
Who or what they have been;
More than he asks what waves
In the moonlit solitude wild
Of the midmost ocean have swelled,
Foamed for a moment, and gone.”

¹ When I was asked to address the South Place Institute on Mysticism, I was not aware that it was intended to publish my words, and so I did not reduce to writing what I proposed to say. The following pages, dictated from memory subsequently to the delivery of my lecture, give, I believe, a tolerably close account of it. I ought to remark that I employ the term Mysticism, not in the proper theological sense, but in the popular sense—put upon it, as I suppose, by those who invited me to speak—the sense, namely, of *supersensuous knowledge*. No one can regret more than I the confusion of tongues which prevails here, as elsewhere, in the terminology of the present day. A feeling of the Infinite is one thing; a cognition is another.

How true a picture it is of the lives of most ! How true, in different degrees, of the lives of all ! What "a poor play," as another poet of a different order has told us, life is, if we look upon it in its merely material aspects ! "Doth not our life consist of the four elements ?" asks Sir Toby, in *Twelfth Night*. "Nay," replies Sir Andrew Aguecheek, "I think it consists rather of eating and drinking." This witness is true. Deeply corporealized, imprisoned by the senses, we resemble those unhappy men of whom Plato tells us in his famous apologue, which I dare say many of you remember. There they sit, and have sat since childhood, those miserable captives, in their underground cavernous prison, with no opening save one above towards the light, fast bound in misery and iron, not able so much as to turn their heads round, and so seeing nothing but what is straight before them. At a distance above and behind them, a bright fire burns, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way, with a low wall built along it, like the screens which the marionette players in ancient Greece put up in front of their audiences, and above which they were wont to display their puppets. Behind this wall, walk a number of persons bearing vessels and images of wood and stone and various other materials, talking as they go ; and the captives, sitting without the power of turning their heads, see their own shadows—which is all they see of themselves and each other—and the shadows cast by these objects upon the part of the cavern facing them, and hear the voices thence reverberated, for there is an echo in their prison-house. And they refer these voices, not to the unseen passers-by, of whom they have no knowledge, but to the passing shadows, which they take for realities. Strange and weird conception ! But how true an image of human life until we are enfranchised from the chains of sense. Yes ; Emerson has well said, in words which may fitly serve as the interpretation of this Platonic parable : "Indeed, we are but shadows, we are not endowed with real life, and all that seems most real about us is but the thinnest substance of a dream, till the heart be touched. That touch creates us ; then we begin to be ; thereby we are beings of reality and inheritors of Eternity." "*Until the heart be touched.*" It is that touch that sets us free ; which rids us of illusions about the make and matter of the phenomenal world ; which reveals to us what I may call the ideal—the real being of a thing which causes it to be what it is.

Now this touch of the heart may come to us in many ways. I remember vividly how, in an autumn which seems as I speak to rise before me across the gulf of years, in all its sadness and sweetness, nature was first revealed to me as a living reality ; a spirit speaking to my spirit ; "a presence that is not to be put by." I can see now those magnificent woods through which I wandered, finding for the first time "tongues in the trees, books in the running brooks" ; hearing for the first time in the moaning of the winds the elegy of the dying year—nay, the burial hymn of the world ; reading for the first time the high moralities, the "thoughts that do lie too deep for tears" inscribed on the falling leaves and the fading flowers.

I dare say many in this room can remember a like awakening of their own inner life; and can enter into what Amiel has expressed in a very fine passage, which came into my mind as I was sitting this morning in my library, thinking about what I should say to you this afternoon. Writing at Lancy, in the early spring of 1852, he exclaims: "How are all things transfigured at a moment like this! The world is an allegory; the ideal is more real than any fact. Fairy tales and legends are as true as natural history; nay, truer, for as emblems they are more transparent. The only substance is the soul. What are all other things? Shadow, pretence, figure, symbol, and dream. Consciousness alone is immortal, objective, utterly real. The world is but a pyrotechnic display, a sublime panorama, intended to delight and educate the soul. Consciousness is a universe of which the soul is love."

Let me in this connection turn to a great English poet—great not only in his inspiration, but in his sobriety—who, more perhaps than any other poet, has realized the occult sympathy between the human soul and external nature. There is a fine passage in his "Excursion," which I must take leave to quote:—

"Such was the boy—but for the growing youth
 What soul was his, when, from the naked top
 Of some bold headland, he beheld the sun
 Rise up, and bathe the world in light! He looked—
 Ocean and earth, the solid frame of earth
 And ocean's liquid mass, in gladness lay
 Beneath him.—Far and wide the clouds were touched,
 And in their silent faces could he read
 Unutterable love. Sound needed none,
 Nor any voice of joy; his spirit drank
 The spectacle: sensation, soul, and form,
 All melted into him; they swallowed up
 His animal being; in them did he live,
 And by them did he live; they were his life.
 In such access of mind, in such high hour
 Of visitation from the living God,
 Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired.
 No thanks he breathed, he proffered no request;
 Rapt into still communion that transcends
 The imperfect offices of prayer and praise,
 His mind was a thanksgiving to the power
 That made him: it was blessedness and love!"

So much for External Nature as an instrument potent to touch the heart, as a revealing agency, as a path into the transcendental, "as a means through which the Deity who works unseen behind it, pours trust and love which transform our own capabilities into realities." And now let us turn to Art, for which I claim the same high function. We rightly talk of artistic inspiration. The true artist is *a surr*. He is the man whose eyes are opened. The aim of the artist is to body forth, whatever be the instrument with which he works—be it the brush, the chisel, "the concord of sweet sounds," or "ordered words"—to body forth something which he discerns in the "high reason of his fancies" more clearly than other men.

I do not know who has better brought out this truth than Schopenhauer — one of the finest and subtlest thinkers of the age, however much his system, as a whole, may repel us. The function of Art he considers is the deliverance of men from the chain of vulgar realities which binds us to the phenomenal world, by presenting the things that have veritable being, the permanent essential forms, immutable, and ever true. Thus do I account of Art in general, and of its high function in the life of man. I can but glance at the subject and pass on. But let me, before I do pass on, read to you the august words in which the greatest living master of our language has expressed this view about one of the Arts—Music:—

"Let us take another instance," says Cardinal Newman, "of an outward and earthly form, or economy, under which great wonders unknown seem to be typified; I mean musical sounds, as they are exhibited most perfectly in instrumental harmony. There are seven notes in the scale; make them fourteen, yet what a slender outfit for so vast an enterprise! What science brings so much out of so little? Out of what poor elements does some great master in it create his new world! Shall we say that all this exuberant inventiveness is a mere ingenuity or trick of art, like some game or fashion of the day, without reality and without meaning? We may do so. To many men the very names which the science employs are utterly incomprehensible. To speak of an idea or a subject seems to be fanciful or trifling, to speak of the views which it opens upon us to be childish extravagance; yet is it possible that that inexhaustible evolution and disposition of notes, so rich yet so simple, so intricate yet so regulated, so various yet so majestic, should be a mere sound, which is gone, and perishes? "Can it be that those mysterious stirrings of heart, and keen emotions, and strange yearnings after we know not what, and awful impressions from we know not whence, should be wrought in us by what is unsubstantial, and comes and goes, and begins and ends, in itself? It is not so; it cannot be. No, they have escaped from some higher sphere; they are the outpourings of eternal harmony in the medium of created sound; they are echoes from our home; they are the voice of angels, or the Magnificat of saints, or the living laws of Divine governance, or the Divine attributes; something are they besides themselves which we cannot compass, which we cannot utter."

I go on to another instrument of our emancipation — Philosophy. Now the very object of all Philosophy worthy of that august name is the supersensuous. A mere system of speculative physics—like, let me say, Mr. Herbert Spencer's—however ingenious and interesting, I cannot account of as Philosophy at all. Philosophy is a theory of being, of speculative thought: its proper object to contemplate the world as a manifestation of spirit. As Hartmann truly says, it is essentially concerned with the one feeling only to be mystically apprehended, namely, the relation of the individual with the Absolute. Its very function

is to raise man above the self of the senses and animal nature to approximate him to the Divine. Hence Aristotle, in speaking the praises of the life philosophic, is led to say: "If the gods in any way concern themselves with human affairs, as is indeed held to be the case, it is but reasonable to suppose that they should take pleasure in that which is of all things the highest and the most akin to the Divine nature; that is to say, the reason; and that to those who give all their love to this, and hold it in the highest honour, they should make some return of kindness, upon the ground that such men bestow their care upon that which they themselves hold dear, and that they act rightly herein and nobly. Now that it is of the philosopher that all this is pre-eminently true is almost self-evident."

I must not dwell further upon this high matter. Let me go on to another portal into the transcendental: those Emotions and Sentiments of Human Nature which are really symbols of something deeper; according to that fine saying of St. Bernard, "The more I know of myself, the more I know of God." Take the passion of love, for example, the most masterful and the most universal of all. I do not speak of that merely animal impulse which man has in common with moths and mollusca; but of love, as it actually exists among civilized men and women, transformed, in a greater or less degree, by the imaginative faculty. Well, what an instrument of emancipation from the senses love is!

" . . . for indeed I know
Of no more subtle master under heaven
Than is the maiden passion for a maid;
Not only to keep down the base in man,
But teach high thoughts and amiable words,
And love of truth, and all that makes a man."

"To keep down the base, to teach high thoughts." Yes. Love lifts us above self. It opens for us the gates of the transcendental world. And so of other human emotions. Terror, like love, lets us into infinity. The effect of tragedy, the Greek philosophers held, was thus to work an intellectual purgation. "The dramatist shows us some elemental force of humanity, stripped of the accidents of time and place, working itself out in free conflict with other forces, and finally breaking itself against the eternal fact that no man can gain the world without losing himself. It is this catastrophe which makes the real tragedy of life; it is this that the tragic poet has the eye to see and the words to portray; and in proportion as we follow him in imagination, we come away from the spectacle with our hearts broken and purged, strengthened to face the fact and obey the law." I may affirm the same even more strongly of sorrow: "'Tis said that sorrow makes us wise." It is a great sacrament: the outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace whereby we are taken—if but for a moment—beyond the veil. When we are led to submit our will to the Divine Goodness, trusting it in the dark, we break through into

Eternity ; we are at one with the Secret Power which dwells there, and holds up and disposes all things, sweetly and strongly. This is the core of nature which, as Goethe says, must be looked for in a man's heart. This is the Everlasting Yea.

But of course the most universal instrument to touch the heart, and to awaken in us the life of the spirit, is Religion. Cardinal Newman has said with much happiness that there is no such thing as a false religion, whatever the amount of error which may be mixed up with any. All religions have done something to lift man above the senses, to idealize life. Is it possible to conceive of anything more distasteful to the thoughtful and cultivated than the blood-and-fire gospel which the Salvationists howl through the streets of our cities, making day hideous? Yet I, for my part, wish these noisy fanatics God-speed, although I should be glad if they could do their work more melodiously. They touch the hearts of thousands who else would live merely animal lives—nay, lives below the level of the animals. *They open for them the world of Spirit and Deity, however coarse and grimy their keys.* It seems to me that the proper attitude to what we deem popular superstition is well indicated by Mr. Herbert Spencer: "Through the great body of dogmas, traditions, and rites, a soul of truth is always visible, clearly or dimly as the case may be. . . . Though from higher perceptions they hide the abstract verity within them, yet to lower perceptions they render this verity more appreciable than it would otherwise be. They serve to make real and influential over men that which would otherwise be unreal and uninfluential. Or we may call them the protective envelopes, without which the contained truth would die; . . . modes of the manifestation of The Unknowable, and as having this for their warrant." Zeal against superstition! Good, if usually a trifle ridiculous. But superstition is not the worst of errors. Take care that while you root up the tares you do not root up the wheat also; that in trying to purify the popular belief you do not destroy it. There is in the Mesnevi Sheriff of Jelâlu'-d-Din, the illustrious Saint and Doctor of Islâm, a striking and pathetic story, in which this great lesson, so little apprehended by the sectaries, whether of Puritanism or of Physics, is powerfully inculcated. "Moses," we read, "in his wanderings in the wilderness, came upon a shepherd, who was praying to God in the fervour of his soul, and saying 'Oh, my Master, my Lord, would that I knew where I might find Thee, and become Thy servant. Would that I might tie thy shoe-latchet, and comb Thy hair, and wash Thy robes, and kiss Thy beautiful feet, and sweep Thy chamber, and serve the milk of my goats to Thee for whom my heart crieth out.' And the anger of Moses was kindled, and he said to the shepherd, 'Thou blasphemest. The Most High has no body, and no need of clothing, nor of nourishment, nor of a chamber, nor of a domestic; thou art an infidel.' And the heart of the shepherd was darkened, for he could make to himself no image of one without bodily

form and corporal wants: and he gave himself up to despair, and ceased to serve God. And God spake unto Moses, and said, 'Why hast thou driven My servant away from Me? Every man has received from Me his mode of being, his way of speech. What is evil in thee, is good in another. What is poison to thee, is honey to him. Words are nothing to Me. I regard the heart. The compass serves only to direct the prayers of those who are without the Kébeh. Within, no one knows the use of it.'" Such is the apologue of the great Sâfi, and surely it is well worth pondering. We are too apt to undervalue that exceeding great multitude of people who are simply good and religious-minded, wholly undisturbed by the anxious questionings which shake the world. They are not intellectually considerable; mostly fools, perhaps. Yes. But diviner lips than Carlyle's have said, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." "Babes and sucklings!" I grant it. But to them are revealed things hidden from the wise and prudent. In the house of the Father of spirits are many mansions. And let not him who dwells in the *templa serena* of elevated thought despise the fetish-worshippers before their shrines, the Peculiar people in their tabernacles, the Salvationists in their "barracks." Unconsciously, passively, they, it may well be, possess that higher synthesis after which we so passionately toil, where the problems which perplex us melt into floating clouds, as we stand for a moment above them in sunshine and serene air.

I have spoken to you of External Nature, of Art, of Philosophy, of Human Emotions, of Religion, as all instruments potent to touch the heart, to open the portals of the transcendental world. Now what is the issue of all this? The issue is the undoubted fact on which Mysticism is built: namely, that the spirit of man comes in contact with a higher spirit, whose manifestations carry with them their own proof and are moral in their nature, out of time and place, enlightening, purifying, and therefore, in a true sense, ascetic. And this is the universal mystic element in religion, in the true sense of the word. For what is that sense? Not a concatenation of formulas, or a tissue of speculations; not pulpit eloquence, hierarchical domination, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, or any other idol of the den or the market-place; but the true tie between our spirit and the Father of our spirits—a transcendental mode of the soul, by which it soars into the Empyrean and is brought back to its eternal beginning. This Theism of the natural order, if you like so to call it, has ten thousand sacraments, infinite and ever new symbols, and each man may minister at its altar. This is what I mean by Mysticism; heart-religion John Wesley called it. In this heart-religion every great faith in the world has originated. By this heart-religion every great faith lives. When this heart-religion dies out of it, its work is done, and its days are numbered; it petrifies into mere formalism. And then it falls to pieces, and its place knows it no more. Of course we have this treasure in earthen vessels. But the treasure is there, however

poor the shrine. Or, to change the metaphor : in all those higher faiths which perform so important a part in mystical philosophy and theology, there is a true light—the light of life. Earthborn clouds may arise and obscure or distort it. But it is there, that kindly light, guiding men on amid the encircling gloom.

So much may suffice, then, to vindicate the position with which I set out—that Mysticism is not nonsense, but good sense ; nay, the best. And now the clock warns me that I have already trespassed sufficiently upon your patience. There are, however, just a very few practical words which I should like to say in conclusion about the abuse and the use of Mysticism. The abuse is obvious. Mysticism is an experience of the Infinite as real as that experience which we found upon the knowledge of the sensible and finite. It is subject to the same laws and conditions also, to the limitations of our nature ; and therefore may issue in utter madness or gross sensuality, precisely as an exclusive study of material phenomena may issue in degradation of the intellect. I need not enlarge upon what is so clear in itself, and is so sadly illustrated by many pages of history. My present object is to dwell upon it in its normal and healthy aspect as “human nature’s daily food.” My view of Mysticism, then, as I have at length brought out, is that it is an opening of the eyes of the soul,—a deliverance from that worst captivity when the mind darkened by sense becomes “the dungeon of itself.” Whatever be the instrument of our emancipation, the effect is to let “us pent-up creatures through, into Eternity—our due.” I may observe, in passing, that one naturally uses the words of the poets in speaking of this subject, and with reason, for truth has two languages—the language of poetry and the language of prose ; but the language of poetry is the most august, and the better fitted for the expression of the higher verities. But to return. I take the office of Mysticism to be this : to conduct us from the phenomenal to the noumenal—from that which seems, to that which is. Now what is that which is but truth, justice, love, freedom, all different aspects of one thing ; nay, I venture to say of One Person—the Absolute and Eternal, who is the Supreme Reason ? This is the office, then, of Mysticism, to enable us to discern that Reason which is at the heart of things and which is in our hearts, to realize that we are one with that Transcendent Ideal, which is the Supremely Real ; not bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh, but—far closer union—reason of His reason and spirit of His Spirit. This is the light of life ; and in that light should we walk—as children of the light. The supremacy of that Divine gift within us, speaking to our heart, through our conscience—this is the conclusion of the whole matter. It is the conclusion of Philosophy, which finds reason the highest principle in the universe. It is the conclusion of Poetry, which finds the world the expression of reason. It is the conclusion of Jurisprudence, which finds in reason the regulating principle of social life. Now not all of us are called to be philosophers, or

poets, or lawgivers ; but we are all men endowed with " this capability and Godlike reason." Let it not " fust in us unused." *Est Deus in nobis* We all have that Divine gift. Marcus Aurelius calls it the *daimon*—the deity—within us. Let me end with the admirable lesson of that imperial sage who has shown us that " even in a palace life may be well led." " Live with the gods. And he does live with the gods who constantly shows to them that his own soul is satisfied with that which is assigned to him, and that he does all that the *daimon* wishes which Zeus has assigned to every man for his guardian and guidance—a portion of himself. And this *daimon* is every man's understanding and reason."

THEOSOPHY.

BY ANNIE BESANT.

IN dealing with a great theme within narrow limits one has alway to make a choice of evils: one must either substantiate each point, buttress it up with arguments, and thus fail to give any roughly complete idea of the whole; or one must make an outline of the whole, leaving out the proofs which bring conviction of the truth of the teaching. As the main object of this paper is to place before the average man or woman an idea of Theosophy as a whole, I elect to take the inconvenience of the latter alternative, and use the expository instead of the controversial method. Those who are sufficiently interested in the subject to desire further knowledge can easily pass on into the investigation of evidences, evidences that are within the reach of all who have patience, power of thought, and courage.

We, who are Theosophists, allege that there exists a great body of doctrines, philosophical, scientific, and ethical, which forms the basis of, and includes all that is accurate in, the philosophies, sciences, and religions of the ancient and modern worlds. This body of doctrine is a philosophy and a science more than a religion in the ordinary sense of the word, for it does not impose dogmas as necessary to be believed under any kind of supernatural penalties, as do the various Churches of the world. It is indeed a religion, if religion be the binding of life by a sublime ideal; but it puts forward its teachings as capable of demonstration, not on authority which it is blasphemy to challenge or deny.

That some great body of doctrine did exist in antiquity, and was transmitted from generation to generation, is patent to any investigator. It was this which was taught in the Mysteries, of which Dr. Warburton wrote: "The wisest and best men in the Pagan world are unanimous in this, that the Mysteries were instituted pure, and proposed the noblest ends by the worthiest means." To speak of the Initiates is to speak of the greatest men of old: in their ranks we find Plato and Pythagoras, Euclid and Democritus, Thales and Solon, Apollonius and Iamblichus. In the Mysteries unveiled they learned their wisdom, and gave out to the world such fragments of it as their oath allowed. But those fragments have fed the world for centuries, and even yet the learned of the modern West sit at the feet of these elder sons of wisdom. Among the teachers of the early Christian Church some of these men were found; they held Christianity in its esoteric meaning, and used exoteric dogmas merely as veils to cover the hidden truth. "Unto you it is given," said Jesus, "to know the

mystery of the kingdom of God, but unto them that are without all these things are done in parables" (Mark iv. 11). Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen both recognise the esoteric nature of the underlying truths of Christianity, as before them did Paul. In West as in East exoteric religions were but the popular representations of the Secret Wisdom. But with the triumph of ecclesiasticism, the Secret Wisdom drew back further and further into the shade, until its very existence slowly faded from the minds of men. Now and then one of its disciples appeared in Christendom, and gave to the world some "discovery" which started thought on some new and fruitful line; thus Paracelsus, with his "discovery" of hydrogen, his magnetic treatment for the cure of disease, and his many hints at secrets of nature not even yet worked out. Trace through the Middle Ages, too often by the lurid light of flames blazing round a human body, the path along which the pioneers of science toiled, and it will be found that the "magicians" and the "wizards" were the finger-posts that marked the way. Passing strange is it to note how the minds of men have changed in their aspect to the guardians of the Hidden Wisdom. Of old, in their passionate gratitude, men regarded them as well nigh divine, thinking no honours too great to pay to those who had won the right of entrance into the temple of the Unveiled Truth. In the Middle Ages, when men, having turned from the light, saw devils everywhere in the darkness, the Adepts of the Right Hand Path were dreaded as those of the Left, and wherever new knowledge appeared and obscure regions of nature were made visible, cries of terror and wrath rent the air, and men paid their benefactors with torture and with death. In our own time, secure in the completeness of our knowledge, certain that our philosophy embraces all things possible in heaven and earth, we neither honour the teachers as gods nor denounce them as devils: with a shrug of contempt and a sniff of derision we turn from them, as they come to us with outstretched hands full of priceless gifts, and we mutter, "Frauds, charlatans!" entrenched as we are in our modern conceit that only the nineteenth century is wise.

Theosophy claims to be this Secret Wisdom, this great body of doctrine, and it alleges that this precious deposit, enriched with the results of the investigations of generations of seers and sages, verified by countless experiments, is to-day, as of old, in the hands of a mighty Brotherhood, variously spoken of as Adepts, Masters, Mahatmas, Brothers, who are living men, evolved further than average humanity, who work ever for the service of their race with a perfect and selfless devotion, holding their high powers in trust for the common good, content to be without recognition, baying power beyond all desires of the personal self.

The claim is a lofty one, but it can be substantiated by evidence. I leave it as a mere statement of the position taken up. Coming to the Western world to-day, Theosophy speaks far more openly than it has ever done before, owing to the simple fact that with the evolution of the race

man has become more and more fitted to be the recipient of such knowledge, so that what would once be taught to only a small minority may now find a wider field. Some of the doctrine is now thrown broadcast, so that all who *can* receive it *may*: but the keys which unlock the mysteries are still committed but to few hands, hands too well tried to tremble under their weight, or to let them slip from either weakness or treachery. As of old so now, the Secret Wisdom is guarded, not by the arbitrary consent or refusal of the teachers to impart instruction, but by the capacity of the student to understand and to assimilate.

Theosophy postulates the existence of an eternal Principle, known only through its effects. No words can describe It, for words imply discriminations, and This is ALL. We murmur, Absolute, Infinite, Unconditioned,—but the words mean naught. SAT, the Wise speak of: BE-NESS, not even Being nor Existence. Only as the Manifested becomes can language be used with meaning; but the appearance of the Manifested implies the Unmanifested, for the Manifested is transitory and mutable, and there must be something that eternally endures. This Eternal must be postulated, else whence the existences around us? It must contain within Itself That which is the essence of the germ of all possibilities, all potencies: space is the only conception that can even faintly mirror It without preposterous distortion, but silence least offends in these high regions where the wings of thought beat faintly and lips can only falter, not pronounce.

The universe is, in Theosophy, the manifestation of an aspect of SAT. Rhythmically succeed each other periods of activity and periods of repose, periods of manifestation and periods of absorption, the expiration and inspiration of the Great Breath, in the figurative and most expressive phraseology of the East. The outbreathing is the manifested worlds; the inbreathing terminates the period of activity. The Root-Substance differentiates into "spirit-matter," whereof the universe, visible and invisible, is built up, evolving into seven stages, or planes, of manifestation, each denser than its predecessor; the substance is the same in all, but the degrees of its density differ. So the chemist may have in his receiver water held invisible: he may condense it into a faint mist-cloud, condense it further into vapour, further yet into liquid, further yet into solid; throughout he has the same chemical compound, though he changes its condition. Now it is well to remember that the chemist is dealing with facts in nature, and that his results may therefore throw light on natural methods, working in larger fields; we may at least learn from such an illustration to clarify our conceptions of the past course of evolution. Thus, from the Theosophical standpoint, "spirit" and "matter" are essentially one, and the universe one living whole from centre to circumference, not a molecule in it that is not instinct with life. Hence the difficulty that scientists have always found in defining "life." Every definition they have made has broken down as excluding some phenomena that they were compelled to recognise as those of life. Sentiency, in our meaning of the word there

may not be, say in the mineral; but is it therefore "dead"? Its particles cohere, they vibrate, they attract and they repel: what are these but manifestations of that living energy which rolls the worlds in their courses, flashes from continent to continent, thrills from root to summit of the plant, pulses in the animal, reasons in the man? One Life and therefore One Law everywhere, not a Chaos of warring atoms but a Kosmos of ordered growth. Death itself is but a change in life-manifestation, life which has outworn one garment and, rending it in pieces, clothes itself anew. When the thoughtless say, "He is dead," the wise know that the countless "lives" of which the human body is built up have become charged with more energy than the bodily structure can stand, that the strain has become too great, that disruption must ensue. But "death" is only transformation not destruction, and every molecule has pure life-essence at its core with the material garment it has woven round itself of its own substance for action on the objective plane.

Each of the seven Kosmic planes of manifestation is marked off by its own characteristics; in the first pure "spirit," the primary emanation of the ONE, subtlest, rarest, of all manifestations, incognisable even by the highest of Adepts save as present in its vehicle, the Spiritual Soul: without form, without intelligence, as we use the word—these matters are too high, "I cannot attain unto them." Next comes the plane of Mind, of loftiest spiritual intelligence, where first entity as entity can be postulated; individualism begins, the Ego first appears. Rare and subtle is matter on that plane, yet form is there possible, for the individual implies the presence of limitation, the separation of the "I" from the "not I." Fourth, still densifying, comes the plane of animal passions and desires, actual forms *on their own plane*. Then, fifthly, that of the vivid animating life-principle, as absorbed in forms. Sixthly, the astral plane, in which matter is but slightly rarer than with ourselves. Seventhly, the plane familiar to all of us, that of the objective universe. Let us delay for a moment over this question of "planes," for on the understanding of it hinges our grasp of the philosophical aspect of Theosophy. A plane may be defined as a state, marked off by clear characteristics; it must not be thought of as a place, as though the universe were made up of shells one within the other like the coats of an onion. The conception is metaphysical, not physical, the consciousness acting on each plane in fashion appropriate to each. Thus a man may pass from the plane of the objective in which his consciousness is generally acting, on to the other planes: he may pass into the astral in sleep, under mesmerism, under the influence of various drugs; his consciousness may be removed from the physical plane, his body passive, his brain inert; an electric light leaves his eyes unaffected, a gong beaten at his ear cannot rouse the organ of hearing; the organs through which his consciousness normally acts in the physical universe are all useless, for the consciousness that uses them is transferred to another plane. But he can see, hear, understand, on the astral plane, see sights invisible to physical

eyes, hear sounds inaudible to physical ears. Not real? What is "real"? Some people confine the real to the tangible and only believe in the existence of a thing that can knock them down with a lesion to prove the striking. But an emotion can slay as swiftly as an arrow; a thought can cure with as much certainty as a drug. All the mightiest forces are those which are invisible on this plane, visible though they be to senses subtler than our own. Take the case of a soldier who in the mad passion of slaughter, the lust for blood, is wounded in the onward charge, and knows not the wounding till his passions cool and the fight is over; his consciousness during the fight is transferred to the fourth plane, that of the emotions and passions, and it is not till it returns from that to the plane of the physical body that pain is felt. So again will a great philosopher, his consciousness rising to the plane of intelligence, become wholly abstracted—as we well say—from the physical plane; brooding over some deep problem, he forgets all physical wants, all bodily appetites, and becomes concentrated entirely on the thought-plane, the fifth, in Theosophic parlance.

Now the consciousness of man can thus pass from plane to plane because he is himself the universe in miniature, and is built up himself of these seven "principles," as they are sometimes called, or better, is himself a differentiation of consciousness on seven planes. It may be well, at this stage, to give to these states of consciousness the names by which they are known in Theosophical literature, for although some people shrink from names that are unfamiliar, there are, after all, only seven of them, and the use of them enables one to avoid the continual repetition of clumsy and inexact descriptive sentences. To Macrocosm and Microcosm alike the names apply, although they are most often found in relation to man. The Spirit in man is named Atma, cognisable only in its vehicle Buddhi, the Spiritual Soul; these are the reflexions in man of the highest planes in the universe. The Spiritual Intelligence is Manas, the Ego in man, the immortal entity, the link between Atma-Buddhi and the temporary personality. Below these come in order Kama, the emotional and passionate nature; Prana, the animating life-principle of the personality; Linga Sarira, the "astral body," the double of the physical, but formed of the somewhat more ethereal "astral" matter; lastly, Sthula Sarira, the physical body. These seven states are grouped under two heads: Atma-Buddhi-Manas make up the trinity in man, imperishable, immortal, the "pilgrim" that passes through countless lives, the *individual*, the True Man. Kama, Prana, Linga Sarira, and Sthula Sarira form the quaternary, the transitory part of the human being, the *person*, which perishes gradually, onwards from the death of the physical body. This disintegrates, the molecules of physical, astral, kamic, matter finding all new forms into which they are builded, and the more quickly they are all resolved into their elements the better for all concerned. The consciousness of the normal man resides chiefly on the physical, astral, and kamic planes, with the lower portion of

the Manasic. In flashes of genius, in loftiest aspirations, he is touched for a moment by the light from the higher Manasic regions, but this comes—only comes—to the few, and to these but in rare moments of sublime abstraction. Happy they who even thus catch a glimpse of the Divine Angooides, the immortal Ego within them. To none born of women, save the Masters, is it at the present time given by the law of evolution to rise to the Atmic-Buddhic planes in man; thither the race will climb millenniums hence, but at present it boots not to speak thereof.

Each of these planes has its own organisms, its own phenomena, the laws of its own manifestation; and each can be investigated as exactly, as scientifically, as experimentally, as the objective plane with which we are most familiar. All that is necessary is that we should use appropriate organs of sensation, and appropriate methods of investigation. On the objective plane we are already able to obey this rule; we do not use our eyes to listen to sounds, and then deny that sounds exist because our eyes cannot hear them; nor do we take in hand the microscope to examine a distant nebula, and then say that the nebula is not there because the field of the microscope is dark. A very slight knowledge of our own objective universe will place us in the right mental attitude towards the unknown. Why do we see, hear, taste, feel? Merely because our physical body is capable of receiving certain impressions from without by way of the avenues of sense. But there are myriads of phenomena, as "real" as those we familiarly cognise, which are to us non-existent, for the very simple reason that our organs of sensation are not adapted to receive them. Take the air-vibrations which, translated into terms of consciousness, we call sound. If an instrument that emits successive notes be sounded in a room with a dozen people, as the notes become shriller and shriller one person after another drops out of the circle of auditors, and is wrapped in silence while still a note is sounding, audible to others there; at last a pipe speaks that no one hears, and though all the air be throbbing with its vibrations, silence complete reigns in the room. The vibration-waves have become so short and rapid that the mechanism of the human ear cannot vibrate in unison with them; the objective phenomenon is there, but the subjective does not respond to it, so that for man it does not exist. Similar illustrations might be drawn in connection with every sense, and it is surely not too much to claim that if on the plane to which our bodies are correlated, phenomena constantly escape our dull perceptions, men shall not found on their ignorance of other planes the absolute denial of their existence. Ignorance can only justify silence, suspension of judgment; it cannot justify denial. Knowledge is necessary for rational belief, but the verifiable assertions of those who claim such knowledge are surely more weighty than the mere denial of ignorance. As in all other branches of scientific inquiry, investigation should precede the formation of opinion, and those who would understand and experiment in the occult regions of nature must, by long, steady, and patient courage, become occultists. Only

informed opinion is of any weight in discussion, and in occult science, as in every other, the mere chatter and vituperation of uninformed criticism do not count. The occultist can be no more moved thereby than Professor Huxley by the assertions of a fourth-standard schoolboy. Those who have time, ability, and courage, can develop in themselves the senses and the capacities which enable the consciousness to come into touch with the higher planes, senses and capacities already evolved and fully at work in some, and to be in the course of ages the common inheritance of every child of man. All the so-called phenomena which have been so much spoken of in connection with H. P. Blavatsky were but the simple outcome of her highly evolved nature, her control over the forces of the objective plane being exercised as naturally and carelessly as the electrician utilises his knowledge to bring about results that would seem miraculous to the African savage. They were but sparks flung outwards by the fire that ever steadily burned within, as difficult for her to smother as for us to live down to a level of civilization far below our own. I know that the exercise of these powers often arouses in the minds of people convinced of their reality an eager desire to possess them, but only those who will pay the price can attain possession. And the first instalment of that price is the absolute renunciation of all that men prize and long for here on earth; complete self-abnegation; perfect devotion to the service of others; destruction of all personal desires; detachment from all earthly things. Such is the *first* step on the Right-Hand Path, and until that step is taken it is idle to talk of further progress along that thorny road. Occultism wears no crown save that of thorns, and its sceptre of command is the seven-knotted wand, in which each knot marks the payment of a price from which the normal man or woman would turn shuddering away. It is because of this that it is not worth while to deal with this aspect of Theosophy at any length. What does concern us is the general plan of evolution, the "pilgrimage" of the Ego, of the individual, encased in the outer shell of the personality.

The evolution of man consists in the acquirement by the Ego of experience, and the gradual moulding of the physical nature into a form which can readily respond to every prompting of the spirit within. This evolution is carried on by the repeated incarnation of the Ego, overshadowed by the spirit, in successive personalities, through which it lives and acts on the objective plane. The task before it when it starts on the wheel of life on this earth, during the present cycle, is to acquire and assimilate all experience, and so to energize and sublimate the objective form of man that it may become a fit instrument and dwelling for the spirit; the complete assimilation of the Ego with the spirit, of Manas with Atma-Buddhi, being the final goal of the long and painful pilgrimage. It is obvious that such work cannot be accomplished in one lifetime, or in a few. For such gigantic task countless lives must be required, each life but one step in the long climbing upward. Each life should garner some

fresh experience, should add some new capacity or strengthen some budding force; thus is builded up through numberless generations the Perfect Man. Hence the doctrine of Re-incarnation is the very core and essence of Theosophy, and according to the hold this belief has on life, so will be the grasp of the learner on all Theosophic truth.

The term Re-incarnation—expressive as it is of the encasing of the Ego in the man of flesh—is very often misunderstood. It implies the indwelling of the Ego in many successive personalities, but it does not imply the possibility of its incarnation in the brute. In many places and at many times this travesty of the doctrine has prevailed, and it has been taught that the re-incarnating Ego may, as penalty for the transgressions of the human personality with which it has been linked, be flung into the vortex of the brute world and inform some lower animal. But this idea is against Theosophical teaching, according to which the Manasic entity can inhabit only man; it is, indeed, the indwelling of this entity which is the distinction between the man and the brute, a distinction which is ever preserved.

There is no doctrine in the range of philosophy which throws so much light on the tangled web of human life as does this doctrine of Re-incarnation. Take, for instance, the immense difference in capacity and in character found within the limits of the human race. In all plants and in all animals the characteristic qualities of a species may vary, but within comparatively narrow limits; so also with man, so far as his outer form, his instincts, and his animal passions, are concerned. They vary of course, as those of the brute vary, but their broad outline remains the same. But when we come to study the differences of mental capacity and moral character, we are struck with the vast distances that separate man from man. Between the savage, counting five upon his fingers, and the Newton who calculates the movements of a planet and predicts its course, how wide and deep a gulf as to intellect! between a barbarian dancing gleefully round the bleeding body of his foe, as he mangles and torments the living tissues, and the Howard who gives his life to save and aid the lowest fallen of his people, how vast the difference as to character! And this leaves out of account those living men, who are as far ahead of Newton and of Howard as these are above the least evolved of our race. Whence the great divergencies, unparalleled among the rest of the organisms on our globe? Why is man alone so diverse? Theosophy points in answer to the re-incarnation of the Ego, and sees in the differing stages of experience reached by that Ego the explanation of the differing intellectual and moral capacities of the personality. "Baby Egos"—as I have heard H. P. Blavatsky call them with reference to their lack of human experience—inform the little-evolved humanity, while those who dwell in the more highly developed races are those who have already garnered much rich harvest of past experience and have thereby become capable of more rapid growth.

The Ego that has completed a span of earth-life, and has shaken off the

worn-out personality that it informed, passes into a subjective state of rest, ere re-assuming "the burden of the flesh." Thus it remains for a period varying in length according to the stage of evolution it has reached. When that period is exhausted, it is drawn back to earth-life, to such environment as is suitable for the growing of the seed it has sown in its past. As surely as hydrogen and oxygen rush into union under certain conditions of temperature and of pressure, is the Ego drawn by irresistible affinity to the circumstances that yield opening for its further evolution. Suitable environment, suitable parents to provide suitable physical body, such are some of the conditions that guide the place and time of re-incarnation. The desire for sentient life, the desire for objective expression, that desire which set the universe a-building, impels the Ego to seek renewed manifestation ; it is drawn to the surroundings which its own past has made necessary for its further progress. Nor is this all. I have spoken of the fact that each plane has its own organisms, its own laws ; the Manasic plane is the plane on which thoughts take forms, objective to all who are able to perceive on that plane. All the experiences of a life, gathered up after death, and the essence, as it were, extracted, have their appropriate thought-forms on the Manasic plane ; as the time for the re-incarnation of the Ego approaches, these with previous unexhausted similar thought-forms pass to the astral plane, clothe themselves in astral matter, and mould the astral body into form suitable for the working out of their own natural results. Into this astral body the physical is builded, molecule by molecule, the astral mould thus, in its turn, moulding the physical. Through the physical body, including its brain, the re-incarnated Ego has to work for the term of that incarnation, and thus it dwells in a tabernacle of its own construction, the inevitable resultant of its own past earth-lives.

To how many of the problems that vex thinkers to-day by the apparent hopelessness of their solution, is an explanation suggested if, for the moment, Re-incarnation be accepted even as a possible hypothesis. Within the limits of a family hereditary physical likeness, often joined by startling mental and moral divergencies ; twins, alike as far as regards heredity and pre-natal environment, yet showing in some cases strong resemblance, in others no less dissimilarity. Cases of precocity, where the infant brain manifests the rarest capacities precedent to all instruction. Cases of rapid gain of knowledge, where the knowledge seems to be remembered rather than acquired, recognised rather than learned. Cases of intuition, startling in their swiftness and lucidity, insight clear and rapid into complicated problems without guide or teacher to show the way. All these and many another similar puzzles receive light from the idea of the persistent individual that informs each personality, and it is a well-known principle in seeking for some general law underlying a mass of apparently unrelated phenomena that the hypothesis which explains most, brings most into accord with an intelligible sequence, is the one most likely to repay further investigation.

To those, again, who shrink from the idea that the Universe is one vast embodiment of injustice, the doctrine of Re-incarnation comes as a mental relief from well-nigh unbearable strain. When we see the eager mind imprisoned in an inefficient body; when we note the differences of mental and moral capacity that make all achievement easy to one, impossible to others; when we come across what seems to be undeserved suffering, disadvantageous circumstances; when we feel longings after heights unattainable for lack of strength; then the knowledge that we create our own character, that we have made our own strength or our own weakness, that we are not the sport of an arbitrary God or of a soulless Destiny, but are verily and indeed the creators of ourselves and of our lot in life—this knowledge comes to us as a support and an inspiration, giving energy to improve and courage to endure.

This immutable law of cause and effect is spoken of as Karma (action) in Theosophy. Each action—using the word to include all forms of activity, mental, moral, physical—is a cause and must work out its full effect. Effect as regards the past, it is cause as regards the future, and under this sway of Karmic law moves the whole life of man as of all worlds. Every debt incurred must be duly paid in this or in some other life, and as the wheel of life turns round it brings with it the fruit of every seed that we have sown. Re-incarnation under Karmic law, such is the message of Theosophy to a Christendom which relies on a vicarious atonement and a swift escape to Paradise when the grave closes on the dead. Re-incarnation under Karmic law, until the fruit of every experience has been gathered, every blunder rectified, every fault eradicated; until compassion has been made perfect, strength unbreakable, tenderness complete, self-abnegation the law of life, renunciation for others the natural and joyous impulse of the whole nature.

But how, it may be asked, can you urge to effort, or press responsibility, if you regard every action as one link in an infrangible chain of cause and effect? The answer lies in the sevenfold nature of man, in the action of the higher on the lower. The freewill of man on this plane is lodged in the Manasic entity, which acts on his lower nature. Absolute freewill is there none, save in the Unconditioned. When manifestation begins, the Universal Will becomes bound and limited by the laws of Its own manifestation, by the fashion of the expression It has chosen as its temporary vehicle. Conditioned, it is limited by the conditions It has imposed on Itself, manifesting under garb of the universe in which It wills to body Itself forth. On each plane Its expression is limited by the capacities of Its embodiments. Now the Manasic entity in its own sphere is the reflexion, the image, of the Universal Will in Kosmos. So far as the personality is concerned, the promptings, the impulses, from the Manasic plane are spontaneous, have every mark of freedom, and if we start from the lowest plane of objective nature, we shall see how relative freedom is possible. If a man be loaded with chains, his muscles will be limited in

their power of movement. They are constrained in their expression by the dead weight of iron pressing upon them ; yet the muscular force is there, though denied outward expression, and the iron cannot prevent the straining of the fibres against the force used in their subdual. Again, some strong emotion, some powerful impulse from the Kama-Manasic plane, may hold rigid the muscles under lesion that would make every fibre contract and pull the limb away from the knife. The muscles are compelled from the plane above them, the personal will being free to hold them rigid or leave them to their natural reaction against injury. From the standpoint of the muscles the personal will is free, and it cannot be controlled save as to its material expression on the material plane. When the Manasic entity sends impulse downwards to the lower nature with which it is linked, conflict arises between the animal desire and the human will. Its interferences appear to the personality as spontaneous, free, uncaused by any actions on the lower plane ; and so they are, for the causes that work on it are of the higher not the lower planes. The animal passions and desires may limit its effective expression on their own plane, but they cannot either prompt or prevent its impulses ; man's true freedom is found when his lower nature puts itself into line with the higher, and gives free course to the will of the higher Ego. And so with that Ego itself : able to act freely on the planes below it, it finds its best freedom as channel of the Universal Will from which it springs, the conscious willing harmony with the All of which it is part. An effect cannot be altered when the cause has appeared ; but that effect is itself to be a cause, and here the will can act. Suppose a great sorrow falls on some shrinking human heart ; the effect is there, cannot be avoided, but its future result as cause may be one of two things ; Kama may rebel, the whole personal nature may rise in passionate revolt, and so, warring against the Higher Will, the new cause generated will be of disharmony, bearing in its womb new evil to be born in days to come. But Kama may range itself obediently with Karmic action ; it may patiently accept the pain, joyfully unite itself to the Higher Will, and so make the effect as cause to be pregnant with future good.

Remains but space for one last word on that which is Theosophy in action—the Universal Brotherhood of Man. This teaching is the inevitable outcome of the doctrines of the One Universal Spirit common to all humanity, Re-incarnation and Karma. Every distinction of race and sex, of class and creed, fades away before the essential unity of the indwelling spirit, before the countless incarnations under all forms of outward garment, making the experience of prince and beggar part of the training of all in turn. Here is to be found the motive-spring of action—love for all mankind. In each child of man the true Theosophist recognises a brother to be loved and served, and in the Theosophical Society, Theosophists, under the direction of the Masters, have formed a nucleus for such Brotherhood of Humanity, and have made its recognition the only obligation binding on all who enter. Amid class hatreds and warring sects it raises

this sublime banner of human love, a continual reminder that essentially all humanity is one, and that the goal to which we travel is the same for all. Without this recognition of Brotherhood all science is useless and all religion is hypocrisy. Deeper than all diversity, mightier than all animosity, is that Holy Spirit of Love. The Self of each is the Higher Self of all, and that bond is one which nothing in all worlds can avail to break. That which raises one raises all; that which degrades one degrades all. The sin and crime of our race are our sin and crime, and only as we save our brethren can we save ourselves. One in our inception, one in our goal, we must needs be one in our progress; the "curse of separateness" that is on us it is ours to remove, and Theosophy alike as religion and philosophy will be a failure save as it is the embodiment of the life of Love.

THE NEW CHURCH, COMMONLY CALLED SWEDENBORGIAN.

BY THE REV. THOMAS CHILD.

It may be asked, "Have we not enough of Churches, and why another one calling itself the New Church?" Well, there never was a new movement which did not begin as a Church; the more secular fraternities of the politician and the reformer are to them as Churches are in religious matters. And as regards the New Church our claim is that it explains the problems which have so long vexed mankind.

Turning then *first* to the Philosophical Aspect of New Church teaching, our primary attitude is not *things as they are*, but *my relation to them*; not, "Do things exist?" but, "What must I, as a rational human being, from the constitution and laws of my nature, believe?" Not primarily whether my belief is answered or matched by existing things, but, "What is it that I am constituted, and thus that reason compels me, to believe?" This is our starting-point. The facts of human nature are the best interpreters of man; if we come down to them and let them speak for themselves, we shall get clear and explicit answers. But men seldom allow reason, as such, to speak, or the facts of their own nature to declare, as they would with unmistakable voice, the things that are true for it, and which that nature is bound, because constituted, to believe. Primarily, for example, I am not concerned with whether God exists, but with whether I ought to believe that God exists as the outcome of my constitution. Afterwards, the question may come as to whether my conception answers to the facts. You may always be sure, however, that what a man acknowledges himself as bound to believe, he will equally declare to be an existing fact. Man then must have a creed, because he has a nature; he has a right to know what his nature can tell him, and he is bound to follow its teachings, whatever they be and wherever they lead him.

Materialists say: "Some things we know. We know that man is matter. We don't know that he is anything else." But have we a right to assume that, inasmuch as we do not see mind acting without matter, therefore mind is the result of matter? We have no such right. These two are simply, so far as we can tell, co-existent; and, being so, scientific inquiry should itself prevent us confounding things that differ. Nobody knows, as a matter of fact, that mind comes from matter.

But what is it that constitutes matter or substance? "Qualities! qualities!" the materialist says. "Destroy a man's organism, & put him

in the fire, for instance,—and where is he? What then are these things you call soul, immortality? They are myths. Don't you see that when you destroy the qualities the man is gone, and gone for ever?"

I accept the position. Qualities constitute "things"; and the qualities of a material thing constitute a material thing, and the qualities of an immaterial thing constitute an immaterial thing; and there's the end of it. Take the principle and follow it up, and where does it lead? To spiritual organization. How is that? In this way. The qualities of a stone constitute a stone; of a chair, a chair. Suppose you take the qualities from the chair. How can you do that? Put it in the fire; the chair and its qualities have gone. Of course there is a residue of dust and gas, having qualities of their own; but the point is, whether the destruction of the qualities of any body is not the destruction of the body itself. Reason and fact answer, "Yes." In man there are two forms of substance. "No," says the materialist, "I deny that." Well, look at the facts, so far as reason can show them. Abstractly speaking, immaterial properties or qualities, if there be such, constitute immaterial things, just as material qualities constitute material things. But are there any such qualities as immaterial qualities? Is thought a material quality? Is feeling a material quality? Surely neither thoughts nor feelings are material. They are not subject to the laws of gravity or cohesion; they cannot be weighed nor measured; and they do not admit of being seen, smell, tasted, heard, or felt. They are, therefore, immaterial properties or qualities, no matter whence they exist as to origin. A series of qualities, known as material, constitute material substance; and (we must not hesitate) a series of qualities known as mental, constitute mental substance. Mental and material qualities are side by side in man.

The mental—or, if you do not object, the spiritual—directs the material; the directed matter is the agent, the means by which the mind works here in a material sphere. Man is a spiritual being at work in a material environment. It appears then that the materialistic position is really undermined, and that another position has taken its place. You put it in a nutshell thus: Qualities constitute substance. There are immaterial qualities; therefore there is immaterial substance.

In what way are we to think of the Infinite Cause, or God? Our only idea must be anthropomorphic—we cannot help ourselves; in the very nature of the case it must be so. Man is bound to think that God must be as *man* is. Don't you know that if a dog could think of God, it would think of Him as a dog, and that a horse would think of Him as a horse? And if you are thinking of God, once more our point is, "What am I, as a human creature, bound to think and believe concerning this Cause, but that He is essentially like me, that He is not less than human—that He is infinitely what I am finitely." Yes; and your reason declares that God *is* like you. You have emotions and feelings; and God has these, has intellect, has energy. God is the origin of man. "God created

man in His own image and likeness." It was from an efflux of the Divine nature passing forth to the external world, and fitting there to itself a material organism taken from dust, that man was brought forth.

Is this transcendent? It is rational. Nothing is more transcendent than the simplest facts of life.

Well, but He may not exist after all; it may be only my idea! Trust the idea which your nature impels you to hold, and all else will come right. Be loyal to the facts of reason, and things as they are will not be far from reason's way.

But I hear another voice, which cries, "You say the mind declares for cause, and you lead the mind up to God as the Cause of all. Then what caused God? Is not God caused too?" No; there is a mistake in the reasoning. Sequence is simply succession. Cause is the stoppage of succession; and your idea that God may be caused is really a denial of cause and a reintroduction of sequence. You take nature's idea of sequence, and read it into Cause. In cause there can be no such succession; there is the beginning of successions. When, therefore, man declares that there is a cause of these successions, the last for him has been reached; and he cannot now, to be true to his nature and reason, apply the law of succession to the Cause, for therein he will be denying what he has already affirmed.

Men have had religion after its kind; and now men have science after its kind; but the two must go together, if there is to be any religion or science worth the name. What evidence, then, does the scientist demand for the knowledge any man would confer upon him? In brief, the evidence of experience, his own or another's.

Turning now to our *second* point (the Spiritual Aspect of the New Church, that is, the sort of evidence which the New Church presents concerning man's future,—the evidence of the senses), I have not seen into that other world, I cannot let you see it; but such is the evidence given. The Lord, as we think, when He would unfold heaven to earth, unfolded it, as He must and could only do, through a man prepared for that purpose. He made it known through that man. I know that it is a risky thing to say here, but I am bound to tell you what I believe. Swedenborg, the man I speak of, says: "I have for thirty years been in open communication, by the Lord's mercy, with the spiritual world." And he gives us its laws; and, curiously enough, the facts interpret the laws, and the laws the facts; and a study of these things impresses the mind with the conviction that here there is no crazy enthusiast, but a man of science, prepared through his science, through all the knowledge the world could give him, for this wider emancipation, this opening of thought and knowledge into the interior sphere, that he might bring forth the facts from thence, and make them known. And now they stand in black and white for the men of to-day to read and ponder and comprehend.

The New Church, then, believes that there is a God acting through the

spiritual world into the natural world. Where is the spiritual world? It is in the natural world as the soul is in the body; and as the soul is the centre and source of all human activity, so is the spiritual world the source and centre of all natural growth and life. The idea of the spiritual world in the natural world affords a key to much which the *isms* of the day leave out. The mission of Swedenborg was to lay open the spiritual world—the causal world—to our apprehension, so that the world of causes and the world of effects might alike be unfolded to the rational apprehension of humanity. Swedenborg explained the facts and laws of both worlds, and the results are at hand for our study.

Third. The Doctrinal Aspects of the New Church. The Bible is not to us as to others. We do not accept it because it is literally true, because the miracles are established, because the prophecy is conclusive. It is not rational that such external things should produce belief, which is an internal matter; it is not rational to perform a miracle to make one believe. Swedenborg has been the means of unfolding this book, the Bible, to us in a way which has never been done before; he says that there is in the books constituting the Scriptures proper—not in all the books which are now bound up with the Bible—a real coherence from one end to the other, and such as could never have been in a merely human construction. Our Church holds the doctrine of the “spiritual sense of the word” which is discerned as men progress from being, spiritually, “big boys” to “grown-up men.” If revelation was closed ages ago, we are now “left out in the cold.” To the very questions disturbing men now there may be found an answer in the “spiritual sense of the word.” [The difference between the literal and the spiritual meaning of Scripture was illustrated by referring to a casket with a beautiful exterior, but the gems which the interior held appeared far more beautiful.] On the lines thus laid down, the Bible was provable to be God’s book, but on no other lines.

As to the doctrines derived from the Bible, they consider that there is nothing in the Bible to warrant the belief in a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead; that is simply impossible; it is an absurdity; three in one is a thing contrary to reason. A trinity of essentials, however, there may be in God. There is a likeness to this in nature; e.g. from the sun emanates heat, light, and energy; and there is a trinity of powers in man. The New Church considers the Father to be the Divine Love; the Son the Thought and Wisdom by means of which all things proceed; and the Holy Spirit the Energy sustaining all things. It wholly disclaims the ordinary idea of the “Atonement.” The Atonement properly means “at-one-ment,” i.e. reconciliation of God and man, not the reconciliation of God to man, but man to God; and this was brought about when God assumed humanity as the Son, and led men from matter to spirit, from death to life. This is an awful thing to say, but the conception possesses rational harmony. The “resurrection of the material body” we do not believe in, inasmuch as when men go into the spiritual world they will

never want a material body more. A spiritual substance is inevitably a spiritual body.

Fourth. The Practical Aspect of the New Church—which may be summed up in the sentence, “All religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good.” That is the practical embodiment of the New Church teaching. It does not deal with mere doctrines, but its motto is, *Doctrine in Life.*

What must that future religion be that will satisfy man? It must be a union of science and religion. A religion capable of being scientifically proved, because organically, humanly based, is the only religion that the future could possibly accept. And it is because this is exactly true of the New Church throughout her universal grasp of facts and principles, because she can give a rational reason for the facts of life and what she alleges in regard to them, because she meets man wholly and explains him through and through, that she stands out distinctively as the exponent of this new era of the world. If the New Church is not a philosophical and spiritual interpretation of man and his surroundings, it is nothing.

THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS.

(COMMONLY KNOWN AS MORMONS.)

BY ELDER JAMES H. ANDERSON (*of Salt Lake City, Utah*).

OF the religious denominations now in existence among men, none have attracted such attention from the others as the organization known as "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," the members of which are popularly, though erroneously, called "Mormons," because of their belief in the divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon, a record of the ancient inhabitants of America. In every nation where the fame of this Church has spread, and where its elders have appeared to teach their faith, one feature which stands pre-eminent is the bitterness with which they are opposed, without even the opportunity of being heard, principally by professed believers in Christianity.

Some there are who are practical in their adherence to the doctrine of religious tolerance, and whose expansive minds lead them to refrain from passing judgment till they hear the case fairly stated. They hesitate to follow popular clamour, preferring to ascertain the truth for themselves rather than give assent to the voice of prejudice and bigotry, which demanded the life of Jesus of Nazareth because He claimed to be the Son of God. But these are the exception; the rule has been to accept without question assertions made against the Latter-day Saints, and to decline to listen to anything in the way of denial or justification. With this prominent fact before us, it is beyond dispute that to this organization, above all others in this generation, must be applied the saying, "For as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against."

Doubtless much of this antagonism is due to ignorance of the true belief, aims and condition of the Latter-day Saints. Certainly it is largely because of gross misrepresentations by those who have constituted themselves their enemies. The reason for assuming this position can be left for explanation to those who occupy it. The purpose of the present occasion is not to consider that branch of the subject, but rather to present the doctrines believed in by the Latter-day Saints, and the reason for that belief. The limited space allotted me will admit of only a brief exposition of those doctrines; all who are desirous of more elaborate explanation may obtain it from the published works of the Church, and from its elders, who will be pleased to present to investigators the Gospel message which they are proclaiming to the world. The present opportunity is

sufficient for but an abridged statement, in plain and simple language, of the religious system under consideration.

This Church presents no formula of religious dogmas. Its creed is: The direct revelation of God to His children. As He is without variable-ness, and is no respecter of persons, so His laws are unchangeable; and whatsoever He gives by the voice of revelation is a law unto the Saints. The organization of this Church was effected at Fayette, New York, on Sunday, the sixth day of April, 1830. Shortly after this event, its presiding Apostle and Prophet, Joseph Smith, was asked for a concise statement of what he and his people believed, and in reply he wrote the following:

ARTICLES OF FAITH OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATIER
DAY SAINTS.

1. We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.
2. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression.
3. We believe that through the atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.
4. We believe that these ordinances are: First, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, Repentance; third, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.
5. We believe that a man must be called of God, by "prophecy, and by the laying on of hands," by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.
6. We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz.: apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.
7. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.
8. We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.
9. We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.
10. We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes. That Zion will be built upon this continent. That Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiac glory.
11. We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where or what they may.
12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates, in obeying, honouring and sustaining the law.

13. We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to *all men*; indeed we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul: "We believe all things, we hope all things"; we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report, or praiseworthy, we seek after these things.

The position taken by the Prophet Joseph Smith and those who have given heed to the doctrines he presented is that they have no new system of religion to offer to the world, but that their message is the fulness of the everlasting Gospel; the Gospel which Paul said was "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth"; the Gospel of which the Bible bears record, and which the Lord Jesus Christ and His disciples taught as the commandment of God to His children. While they testify that it is a new revelation to them in this dispensation, "the latter days," and that they received through heavenly messengers sent from the throne of the great Jehovah all the knowledge they possess of the plan of salvation, and also the authority to preach the Gospel and administer in its ordinances, they point out that it is the same Gospel and divine message that was revealed to man in ancient days; the "one faith" of which Paul spake to the Ephesians; the everlasting Gospel, *the* plan instituted by God for the salvation of His children—unchangeable, eternal, and transcendently perfect.

Upon this presentation of the case, then, are they to be judged. They thus place every principle or doctrine within the field of comparison with the Holy Scriptures, both in the Old and the New Testament.

THE GODHEAD.

The first of the Articles of Faith declares a belief "in God the Eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." That is, that the Father is a personage of spirit, glory and power, possessing all perfection and fulness; the Son a personage of tabernacle also, who is the express image of His Father, and possesses the same fulness with the Father, in whose image also man is created; and the Holy Ghost, that which bears record of the Father and the Son, the life-giving element in all nature, the agent of God's power, by which, through faith, all things are controlled. These three constitute the Supreme governing power, the Godhead, and are one—above all, and in all, and through all—omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent.

The idea thus set forth is that, in form, man is the image of his Creator. The Bible contains no suggestion of a similarity in form with any other of the creations of the Almighty. But with respect to man it is distinctly expressed in Genesis i. 26, 27: "And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So

God created man in His own image ; in the image of God created He them."

Paul, in writing of God, says that Jesus was the "express image of His person" (Heb. i. 3), being "in the form of God" (Phil. ii. 6). In the record which Matthew has made of the Lord's baptism, he describes the action of the three who constitute the Godhead ; Jesus receiving the baptism of water, the "Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him," and a voice—the voice of the Father—uttering from heaven, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 16, 17). The Redeemer of the world Himself testifies of their individuality: "For as the Father hath life in Himself ; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself ; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man" (John v. 26, 27) ; "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father : for my Father is greater than I" (John xiv. 28) ; "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth ; it expedient for you that I go away : for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John xviii. 7) ; "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me" (John xv. 26).

In the solemn prayer offered up before His betrayal, the Divine Master besought His Father, in behalf of His disciples, "That they all may be one ; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us : that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest me I have given them ; that they may be one even as we are one" (John xvii. 21, 22). The unity of purpose and action in all things constitutes the oneness. This union Jesus sought to bring to His apostles, that, each having his distinct personality, they might be one, "even as we are one."

MEN JUDGED BY THEIR WORKS.

"We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression."

By this transgression death came into the world, that men might gain the experience of a mortal probation. But that man should be held responsible for an act in which he had no agency would evidently be an injustice. Our Father, being a just God, must therefore deal justly with His children. What is the doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the responsibility of men ? In Jeremiah xvii. 10 it is announced : "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." As the laws of truth and justice are inflexible in their operation and effect, judgment as certainly follows evil as blessings result from good deeds.

The beloved apostle, in recording his vision of the judgment, tells us :

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works" (Rev. xx. 12, 13). Language can be no plainer to inform mankind of the evidence that will be adduced for or against them at the judgment-seat of Christ. It will be their deeds; and from the judgment they will make no appeal, for they cannot but realize its justice.

By the divine law, man is answerable for his own sins. He is not compelled to bear the wrongs of another in the reward which he will receive at God's judgment. The transgression of Adam was not ours, and can have no ill effects upon us; it rather becomes a blessing by the mercy of Jehovah. The Latter-day Saints believe that, as by Adam death came into the world, without our action, so is life the free gift to all men through the atonement of the Lord Jesus. This is the doctrine of the Bible. Paul expresses it thus: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 12, 18). The Lord has permitted no doubt to remain respecting the sins for which men will be punished and the good for which they will be rewarded. His word is: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27). The testimony which He gave to John the Divine on the Isle of Patmos was: "I will give every one of you according to your works" (Rev. ii. 23); "And behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be" (Rev. xxii. 12).

THE ATONEMENT.

"We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel."

By this atonement is brought the victory over death; the resurrection of the body to life; the raising of man to a position where he is not subject to death. But it goes farther in the article of faith read. It brings salvation by obedience to the Gospel. Salvation, then, is more than a redemption from the fall. The latter comes to man without his agency, so far as the mere restoration to life is concerned. That is the doctrine which the apostles taught: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22). Since the Saviour brought to pass the resurrection and the life, His atonement has

an universal application, and "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts xxiv. 15).

Does the atonement do more? The Latter-day Saints reply in the affirmative. Matthew (chap. i. 21) records that the angel declared to Joseph, when foretelling the birth of the infant Jesus, "For He shall save His people from their sins." The Apostle Peter says: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12). By obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel, salvation comes to man; it is that which is added to the children of men by the atoning blood of the Redeemer, when the requirements of His Gospel are complied with. Until this is done, there is no salvation from sin. The Apostle John makes this unequivocal declaration: "This then is the message which we have heard of Him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 5-7). If we would be cleansed from all sin by the blood of Christ Jesus, the condition is that "we walk in the light as He is in the light." If this be not our course, the apostle says "we lie, and do not the truth." To these teachings is placed the seal and testimony of the Divine Master Himself in His sermon on the mount: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 21).

THE GOSPEL ORDINANCES—FAITH.

"We believe that these ordinances are: First—Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."

The principle of faith is the moving cause of all action in intelligent beings. Faith in the Lord is the fundamental principle leading to obedience to His will. It is the assurance which we have of unseen things. By its exercise we are alone able to approach the throne of grace. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him; for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 6). It is not a mere passive belief; but being a principle of action and power, it inculcates works in harmony with itself. The Saviour says: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto My Father" (John xiv. 1, 12).

It is the belief of the Latter-day Saints that the Gospel is the working law of Christ; that faith in Him, to have life, must be accompanied by works in accord with the mental exercise of faith. As the Apostle James

says: "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves" (i. 22). This apostle writes, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also"; and in the second chapter of his epistle (verses 14-24) he states: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

The Lord saith, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment" (Matt. xxii. 37, 38). He also explains what it is to love God: "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me: and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him" (John xiv. 21). This is faith in and love of God: keeping His commandments.

REPENTANCE.

"Second—Repentance."

To those who, on the day of Pentecost, believed on the apostles' words, and had awakened within their hearts faith in the Lord Jesus, Peter gave the law of the Gospel: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts ii. 38, 39). This law was universal in its application. It was "to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

When John the Baptist came in the wilderness of Judea, as the messenger before the Lord, preaching "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," he proclaimed, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii. 2). Of those who presented themselves for baptism he required conformity to the doctrine which preceded it. If they had not repented, the ordinance of baptism was refused to them

When many of the Pharisees and Sadducees came, he called them a "generation of vipers," and demanded that they "bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. iii. 7, 8). God "commandeth all men everywhere to repent"—to turn from evil and walk in righteousness, for therein only is salvation. The Lord says, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke xiii. 3).

BAPTISM.

"Third—Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins."

To the repentant believer this is the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" taught by John the Baptist (Mark i. 4). On the day of Pentecost Peter pointed the way to salvation, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38). When the jailor sought to be saved, Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord," and he "was baptized, he and all his straightway" (Acts xvi. 30-33).

So important is this ordinance for admission into the Church of God, that the Lord Jesus insisted on receiving it at the hands of John the Baptist, who was authorized to administer it. John had preached that there should come after him One who should baptize "with the Holy Ghost and with fire," and when Jesus presented Himself on Jordan's banks the prophet recognised that mightier One. He felt his own weakness in the presence of the Son of God, and said, "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" But Jesus knew the law of God. He knew that it was necessary for even the Son of man to enter at the door, and obey the ordinance which His Father had appointed. Therefore He answered John, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15). Then the Saviour of the world went down into the river Jordan and was baptized of John. When He came out of the water, there was given that glorious manifestation of the approval by His Father of the act of submission to the divine law, "and lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him: and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 16, 17).

If it was necessary for the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world, to receive the ordinance of baptism at the hands of one having authority to administer it, that He might "fulfil all righteousness," wherein can sinful man hope to enter by any other way? And when that act of obedience to law on the part of the Divine Master was signalized by the glorious descent upon Him of the Holy Ghost, and brought forth from the Eternal Father the solemn declaration that He was well pleased with the Son who had just passed through the baptism of water, who among men dare say that the ordinance is vain, and useless, and non-essential; that it is not of paramount importance to those who would do the will of the Father?

The Lord also declared that the baptism of John was "the counsel of God"—this ordinance that was "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Said Jesus, "All the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John; but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke vii. 29, 30). As the Lord went forth in His ministry, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, there came to Him Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. To him Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii. 3). Nicodemus did not fully comprehend this saying, and made further inquiry, receiving a reply in language that none need misunderstand; "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). Therefore, when the Master commissioned His disciples and sent them out, after they had been "endowed with power from on high," the command which they received and obeyed was: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

In this labour of the ministry, to which they had been called and ordained of the Lord, He fulfilled His promise, and was with them: "And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following" (Mark xvi. 20). The apostles taught, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins" (Acts ii. 38); "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection" (Rom. vi. 3-5); "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead" (Col. ii. 12). Here, then, is the Gospel doctrine: Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins—performed by one having authority; the birth, the burial, the planting in the watery element, without which ordinance the Lord has said no man can enter the kingdom of heaven.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

It may be suggested that there are millions of the human family who have not had the opportunity of receiving of the baptism of repentance by one having divine authority—millions who never even heard the name of Jesus Christ. The Latter-day Saints believe that the Gospel provides

for all ; that there is and can be no exception ; that every one who will may partake of the waters of life freely ; that God is no respecter of persons, but judges men by their works. A plan of salvation that is adapted to the few, that does not open the door to every being within the great brotherhood of man, is unworthy of the Creator and God of the universe. The Gospel of the Lord must be perfect, even as He is perfect, and reach to all humanity.

The query is made, How did the thief who died on the cross enter the kingdom of heaven ; there is no record of his baptism ? Let the Scriptures give the answer : "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise" (Luke xxiii. 42, 43) The Lord did not say he could enter His kingdom, for He had told Nicodemus that to do that it was necessary to be "born of the water and of the spirit"; but He promised the penitent thief that on that day he should be with Him in paradise. Is that not heaven ? Let us examine and see, for on the proper ascertainment of this fact depends a great principle of truth.

The body of Jesus was three days in the tomb, when the spirit again entered into it. When the Redeemer had risen, Mary came to the sepulchre and found that the body of her Master was not there. She began to inquire, when she heard a voice which she recognised as that of the Lord, to whom she turned. "Jesus saith unto her, Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father: but go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God" (John xx. 17). Here is the testimony of Jesus Himself that during the three days subsequent to His crucifixion, while His body lay in the tomb, His spirit did not go to heaven or the presence of His Father. Logically, it must follow, neither did that of the thief.

Where, then, did He go ? As Jesus was not in His Father's presence during these three days, where was He ? The Scriptures have not left us in doubt upon this point. Jesus transferred to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and placed him at the head of the Twelve Apostles. Surely he is a competent witness ; he says : "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Peter iii. 18, 19). During the time of His absence from the body He was preaching "unto the spirits in prison"—the place where the thief also went.

This doctrine of preaching the Gospel to the dead was taught by the Lord to His apostles, just previous to His crucifixion : "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice" (John v. 25, 28). On the same subject the chief apostle

says : " For, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit " (1 Peter iv, 6).

The dead are to be " judged according to men in the flesh," and as the Lord has declared that " Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit," he cannot enter the kingdom, what shall the dead who " hear the voice of the Son of God " do ? Is the Gospel plan imperfect in that it does not provide a way for those who have had no opportunity to receive that birth ? God forbid. Such an injustice cannot be. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians respecting the resurrection, says : " Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all ? Why then are they baptized for the dead ? " (1 Cor. xv. 29). The answer is complete. The dead may be officiated for by those who dwell in the flesh.

This is the doctrine of salvation for the dead, an important part of the glorious Gospel that is broad as the universe, and from everlasting to everlasting. By receiving the baptism for the dead, those who have passed into the spirit-world have opened to them the door of the kingdom of heaven. " But one man cannot act in the place of another," is the suggestion that comes. The objector has surely forgotten, or has not contemplated the great truth that the whole Gospel plan taught in the Scriptures rests upon the vicarious atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

THE HOLY GHOST.

" Fourth—Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost."

When the Apostle Peter preached to those who sought salvation, he said, " Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call " (Acts ii, 38, 39). Here is the offer to all of this blessed boon, the gift of the Holy Ghost, after baptism for the remission of sins. It was to them, and their children, and to all that are afar off. There was no exclusiveness in this ; the Gospel was open to all. By conforming to its laws, men receive the benefits of their own obedience. It is the great natural order of cause and effect. Comply with the conditions, the result must follow. The sincerely repentant believer, baptized in the proper manner, and by an authorized servant of God, is entitled to the gift of the Holy Ghost as a matter of right.

How is he to receive it ? Just as did the baptized believers under the ministry of the apostles : " Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John : who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost (for as yet He was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus). Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy

Ghost" (Acts viii. 14-17). The Ephesians also "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (Acts xix. 5, 6).

Of the office of the Holy Ghost the Lord says: "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you" (John xvi. 13, 14). Here is the promise of guidance and revelation by the Holy Ghost. Its gifts are wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, working of miracles, discernment of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, etc. (1 Cor. xii. 4-11). Wherever the Holy Ghost is bestowed, there are its gifts and graces manifest.

DIVINE AUTHORITY.

"We believe that a man must be called of God, 'by prophecy and by the laying on of hands,' by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof."

The testimony of Scripture upon this is that Jesus "ordained twelve, that they should be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils" (Mark iii. 14, 15). To His apostles He said: "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever you shall ask of the Father in My name, He may give it you" (John xv. 16); and of them, in praying to His Father, He testified: "As Thou hast sent Me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John xvii. 18). His Father had sent Him, and had "given Him authority," and in like manner He gave authority to His apostles. They in turn commissioned others to act in the ministry—"they ordained them elders in every church" (Acts xiv. 23). As Paul has said, "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4). Aaron was called by the voice of God, through Moses (Exod. iv. 14, 15).

The acts of those who are authorized to officiate in the ordinances of the Gospel—to whom are committed the keys of the kingdom—are recognised by the Lord, and are given full force. "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19). But those not so authorized receive no such recognition.

OFFICERS.

"We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz.: apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc."

The Apostle Paul taught that there was "one Lord, one faith, one

baptism"; and said of the Redeemer, "Wherefore He saith, when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 8, 11). He also preached: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 27, 28).

God set these in the Church, is the apostle's testimony. Shall man say that they are not proper? The Lord has never changed the organization; on the contrary, these officers were given "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv. 12-14).

Is there work for the ministry? Are the Saints yet to be perfected? Are we still far from the unity of the faith? Are we less than the stature of the fulness of Christ in the knowledge of God? With the present spectacle of jarring sects, religious discords, and disputations of doctrines, no intelligent person would venture to give other than an affirmative reply to these inquiries. There is evidently abundant work for the ministry, and therefore a necessity for apostles, prophets, and all the officers that God has set in His Church. Wherever that Church is organized upon the earth, there will these officers be found, with all the authority, gifts and powers that accompany the offices. The Church which has them not is not the Church of Christ, according to the evidence presented by the word of God.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

"We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing interpretation of tongues, etc."

These are the gifts of the Spirit, which Christ promised should follow the believers. They are the signs which confirmed the preaching of the Gospel by the apostles: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In My name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following" (Mark xvi. 15-20).

Of these are the miracles wrought by our Lord and Saviour. God hath set in the Church "miracles, gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 26). Never at any time has He said they should be done away. He is an unchangeable being, a God of miracles to-day as much as at any period of the world's history. He cannot be otherwise and still occupy His exalted position. He cannot be shorn of His power to manifest the gifts of His Spirit among the children of men, when the latter comply with His laws. His arm is not shortened, nor His power to save diminished. If miracles, and healings, and prophecy, and the other gifts of the Spirit do not exist among men, it is for the same reason that in ancient days the Lord Jesus, in "His own country," "could do no mighty work, save that He laid His hands on a few sick folk and healed them," namely, "because of their unbelief" (Mark vi. 6, 7).

Those who dwell on the earth to-day are equally the children of our Father with those who lived nineteen centuries ago, and have an equal claim on His blessings if they observe His laws and exercise the same faith in Him as did His disciples anciently. "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off," said Peter, in his proclamation of the Gospel, of which Paul said, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 8).

THE APOSTASY.

The Latter-day Saints believe that but for the apostasy of the primitive Christian Church, it would have remained with the same organization, powers and ordinances; with apostles, prophets, healings, miracles, and all the gifts of the Spirit, up to the present time. That these ceased to exist among men is proof that there has been a departure from the Gospel. If the organization had remained it would have been in the same form as God placed it, and the true successors to the apostles would have followed their example when they filled the vacancy made in the Twelve by Judas's apostasy—by selecting Matthias to be numbered with the apostles (Acts i. 26). But there was no succession to the Twelve through the generations which succeeded them, therefore the organization ceased to exist among men.

If there was to be an event of such importance in the world's history as a great apostasy, surely the disciples would have had an intimation of it through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. By reference to their writings we find that they had this knowledge, and prophesied concerning it. Paul wrote to Timothy that the time would come when men would not endure sound doctrine, but would heap to themselves teachers, and turn away from the truth (2 Tim. iv. 3, 4). He also taught that in the last days perilous times should come, when men should be "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (2 Tim. iii. 1-5).

To the Thessalonians was borne this testimony respecting the great apostasy: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way" (2 Thess. ii. 1-7). "The 'mystery of iniquity' was making its influence felt at that early day. Paul had warned the people of what was coming; as he says, 'When I was yet with you I told you these things.'"

In the record of the vision given to the Apostle John, which he says was "the revelation of Jesus Christ," we are informed that John was shown "things which shall be hereafter." Of one of the beasts which he saw as typical of a power which should rise up in the earth, it is said, "And it was given to him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations" (Rev. xiii. 7).

This is some of the scriptural evidence concerning the great power which was to deceive the nations of the earth, and pervert the Gospel by teaching men and women that apostles and prophets were not necessary, and that the gifts of the Holy Ghost were done away, till Christendom has been brought to the apostate condition in which it is to-day. So complete was the work of this "mystery of iniquity," of the beast that "made war with the saints and overcame them," that it was necessary for an angel to be sent from heaven with the Gospel message for mankind. John says of this event: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people" (Rev. xiv. 6)

THE BOOK OF MORMON.

"We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God."

For people who believe the Bible to be the word of God to also believe that another record is His word, the two must be consistent with each other. There can be no conflict between them. For both to be the Word of God, they must be divinely inspired, and their teachings be in perfect harmony. While it would by no means be certain that a record which has passed through so many hands as have the Bible manuscripts, with a

loss of some, at least, of the sacred writings, would contain a reference to another record which was to be made by a separate branch of the House of Israel, yet it would not be unreasonable to hope that possibly an allusion to it might be found in some of the prophetic writings.

This hope is not without foundation with respect to the Book of Mormon, which is a history of a part of the House of Israel, on the American continent. The Prophet Ezekiel says: "The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the House of Israel his companions: and join them one to another into one stick: and they shall become one in thine hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show unto us what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and they shall be one in Mine hand" (Ezekiel xxxvii. 15-19).

The "stick of Judah" is the record which we have of the Jews—the Bible; the "stick of Ephraim" is the other record, which we have in the Book of Mormon; and both records have become one in the hand of the Lord. Hosea says that to Ephraim had been written the great things of the law (Hosea xiii. 12), and the Saviour informed His disciples of others that He must visit: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd" (John x. 16). These other sheep were to hear His voice—to receive a personal visit from Him.

The history of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon is, briefly stated, that its existence and whereabouts were revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith by an angel sent from heaven. This angel said his name was Moroni, and that in the year A.D. 420 he had buried the sacred record in the hill Cumorah, which is located in the northern part of the State of New York. After Joseph had received several visits and had been instructed by the heavenly messenger, the plates were entrusted to his care, with a Urim and Thummim for their translation. Each plate was six inches wide and eight inches long, and not quite as thick as common tin. They were filled with engravings in Egyptian characters, and bound together in a volume, as the leaves of a book, with three rings running through the whole. The volume was something near six inches in thickness, a part of it being sealed. The characters on the unsealed part were small and beautifully engraved. The whole book exhibited many marks of antiquity in its construction, and much skill in the art of engraving. The Urim and Thummim consisted of two transparent stones set in the rim of a bow fastened to a breastplate. The unsealed portion of the plates was translated, and the whole were again taken charge of by the angel. The part

which had been translated was published early in 1830, as the Book of Mormon, according to the command of God. It is an abridgment made by the Prophet Mormon, father of Moroni, from the records of his forefathers. On the title-page is this statement :

"Wherefore it is an abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites ; written to the Lamanites who are a remnant of the house of Israel ; and also to Jew and Gentile : written by way of commandment, and also by the Spirit of prophecy and of revelation. Written and sealed up, and hid up unto the Lord, that they might not be destroyed ; to come forth by the gift and power of God unto the interpretation thereof : sealed by the hand of Moroni, and hid up unto the Lord, to come forth in due time by the way of Gentile ; the interpretation thereof by the gift of God.

"An abridgment taken from the Book of Ether also ; which is a record of the people of Jared ; who were scattered at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people when they were building a tower to get to heaven ; which is to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel what great things the Lord hath done for their fathers ; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord, that they are not cast off forever ; and also to the convincing of the Jew and Gentile that JESUS is the CHRIST, the ETERNAL GOD, manifesting Himself unto all nations. And now if there are faults, they are the mistakes of men : wherefore condemn not the things of God, that ye may be found spotless at the judgment-seat of Christ."

Several persons were permitted to view the plates, among the number being the "Three Witnesses," who thus testify of what they saw and heard :

"THE TESTIMONY OF THREE WITNESSES.—Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people unto whom this work shall come, that we through the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, have seen the plates which contain this record, which is a record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites, their brethren, and also of the people of Jared, who came from the tower of which hath been spoken ; and we also know that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for His voice hath declared it unto us ; wherefore we know of a surety that the work is true. And we also testify that we have seen the engravings which are upon the plates ; and they have been shown unto us by the power of God, and not of man. And we declare with words of soberness, that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates, and the engravings thereon ; and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that we beheld and bear record that these things are true ; and it is marvellous in our eyes, nevertheless the voice of the Lord commanded us that we should bear record of it ; wherefore, to be obedient unto the commandments of God, we bear testimony of these things. And we know that if we are faithful in Christ, we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men, and be found spotless before the judgment-seat of Christ,

and shall dwell with Him eternally in the heavens. And the honour be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, which is one God. Amen.

OLIVER COWDERY,
DAVID WHITMER,
MARTIN HARRIS."

From that testimony they never varied. They were separated from the Latter-day Saints, having departed from the Church, to which they belonged for a time after its organization. But nothing could induce them to change their statement. It was true, and they knew it. In their old age Oliver Cowdery and Martin Harris returned to the Church. David Whitmer never did. He was the last to survive, his death having occurred in January 1888, at Richmond, Missouri. When on his deathbed, he called his family and friends around him, and made to them a solemn declaration that he knew the Book of Mormon, and his testimony thereto, to be true.

There were also eight others who testify as follows :—

"THE TESTIMONY OF EIGHT WITNESSES.—Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people unto whom this work shall come, that Joseph Smith, Jun., the translator of this work, has shown unto us the plates of which hath been spoken, which have the appearance of gold; and as many of the leaves as the said Smith hath translated, we did handle with our hands; and we also saw the engravings thereon, all of which has the appearance of ancient work, and of curious workmanship. And thus we bear record with words of soberness, that the said Smith has shown unto us, for we have seen and hefted, and know of a surety that the said Smith has got the plates of which we have spoken. And we give our names unto the world, to witness unto the world that which we have seen; and we lie not, God bearing witness of it.

CHRISTIAN WHITMER,	HIRAM PAGE,
JACOB WHITMER,	JOSEPH SMITH, Sen.
PETER WHITMER, Jun.	HYRUM SMITH,
JOHN WHITMER,	SAMUEL H. SMITH."

Like the three, they never faltered in maintaining that what they had subscribed to respecting the Book of Mormon was the truth, and was with them an absolute knowledge.

Of further evidence concerning the authenticity of the Book of Mormon, there is in this sketch an opportunity of saying but little. Regarding the external proof, it must suffice to merely call attention to the developments of archaeological research on the American continent. When the Book of Mormon was first published, it was the accepted theory of the civilized world that America was not peopled by any nation of ancient times which had made marked progress in civilization. But subsequently, from the appearance of Captain Dupaix's book in 1834-5, followed by the evidence

of Lord Kingsborough, Stevens and Catherwood, Powell, and other well-known archæologists and explorers, a change came with respect to this matter, until now there is no doubt of the advanced position reached by ancient American civilization, as well as of the great antiquity of the native American races. The ruined temples and crumbling palaces of the ancient cities of Uxmal, Copan, Palenque, Quiché, and scores of others, whose architecture rivals that of any contemporaneous cities of the Old World, bear silent but incontrovertible testimony to the historical truth of the Book of Mormon.

With internal evidence of its divine authenticity, the volume itself is amply provided. It presents a code of ethics whose purity and godliness are unexcelled by any publication that has seen the light of day. In its pages there are no anachronisms and no contradictions. The various writers are in perfect accord. Compared with the great truths of science and nature, there are no absurdities and no inconsistencies. Between it and the Bible there is complete harmony in doctrine and in prophecy. It is a book that would be profitable reading to any thoughtful person. No intelligent, honest and sincere seeker after truth can give it thorough examination and consideration, with an understanding of the circumstances under which it was brought forth, without being convinced that in giving to the world the Book of Mormon, God has wrought one of the greatest miracles of any age or time.

REVELATION.

"We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

When the Lord promised His disciples the Holy Ghost, He informed them that it would teach them all things (John xiv. 26); "He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you" (John xvi. 14). This was a direct promise of revelation through the medium of the Holy Ghost; therefore belief in revelation is a scriptural doctrine. It is the communication to men of knowledge from God: "Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come" (John xvi. 13). This is the word of the Lord—that the Holy Ghost should reveal things to come. The same condition which caused the withdrawal of the other gifts of the Spirit, also caused the withdrawal of the gift of revelation. It was because of the apostasy—the unbelief of man. Never has the Lord said that He would reveal no more to the children of men. But He has forbidden men to add to or take from that which He reveals (Rev. xxiii. 18, 19). Whenever the Almighty has authorized servants upon the earth, there is with them the gift of revelation. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets" (Amos iii. 7). The

apostle says that if a man lacks wisdom, and asks in faith for God to bestow it on him, He will do so liberally (James i. 5, 6).

RESTORATION OF THE GOSPEL.

The tidings which the Latter-day Saints bear to the world are that the Gospel has been restored to earth in this dispensation ; that the present is the time of which Paul wrote, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth ; even in Him" (Eph. i. 10). It is this restoration which John the Revelator saw in vision on the Isle of Patmos, and of which he says : "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him ; for the hour of His judgment is come : and worship Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters" (Rev. xiv. 6, 7).

The Latter-day Saints testify that this angel has appeared, and has restored the Gospel, which is now being preached to the nations. It is the same now as anciently, with all the gifts, powers, and blessings. Nothing is lacking. It is presented to all people for their consideration. The most thorough investigation is invited. There is nothing to conceal or hold back. It is not the province of the Gospel to put its light under a bushel, but to entreat all men to come forward and test its truth. "Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good," was the admonition of the Apostle Paul. The same invitation is extended to-day.

Men are given intelligence ; they are in possession of reasoning power. It is an insult to Deity to say that He forbids us to use these in seeking for knowledge. He asks for intelligent conformity to the eternal laws of truth, not for blind obedience to the dogmas of men. He has given to man his free agency. As expressed in the hymn :—

" Know this, that every soul is free
To choose his life and what he'll be ;
For this eternal truth is given,
That God will force no man to heaven.

" He'll call, persuade, direct aright—
Bless him with wisdom, love and light—
In nameless ways be good and kind,
But never force the human mind.

" Freedom and reason make us men ;
Take these away, what are we then ?
Mere animals, and just as well
The beasts may think of heaven or hell."

This free agency was recognised by the Divine Master, who said to the Jews, "Search the Scriptures ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39). To this testimony and counsel of the Lord the Latter-day Saints direct attention.

OTHER DOCTRINES.

Of the other principles believed in by the Latter-day Saints, there is not now time to speak at length. These are, the Gathering of Israel; the Restoration of the Ten Tribes; the Support of Earthly Governments for the Protection of Human Rights; the Building up of Zion and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem; the Resurrection; the Second Coming of Christ to reign as Lord of lords and King of kings—all of which are doctrines of the Bible, as clearly maintained in its teachings as those which have been spoken of.

It may be well to refer to their ordinance of marriage, of which there appears to be such a misunderstanding in the world. This can be briefly stated. The Latter-day Saints believe that marriage is ordained of God; that He has revealed to them its everlasting covenant; that when the ceremony is performed by His authority, the union of husband and wife is eternal—that it is bound on earth and bound in the heavens. "And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Mark x. 8, 9). It is a covenant that is entered into voluntarily by the parties; there can be no compulsion in this or in any of the ordinances of the Gospel. The Saints also believe that the patriarchal order of marriage, which was observed by holy men and women of old, is in consonance with the laws of God and of nature. This order includes a plurality of wives, as it was taught and practised by prophets of God in ancient times. Many people revile against it, frequently because they are ignorant of its harmony with natural laws, but it ill becomes those who profess a belief in Christianity to say that God ever gave to His children a law that was sinful in its nature or pernicious in its effects; to thus reproach the justice and righteousness of the Almighty is blasphemy.

With the Latter-day Saints the principle of celestial marriage is the union of husband and wife for time and eternity. They believe the family relation exists in the celestial kingdom of God. They also have pronounced views upon the purpose of the union of the sexes. They do not believe that its object is the gratification of passion, but that such an idea is wicked in its inception and damning in its practice. They believe that a departure from the paths of virtue is punishable by the severest penalties, and that the violation of the marriage covenant is an offence which ranks next to the crime of murder.

A GLANCE AT HISTORY.

The Prophet Joseph Smith was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, U.S.A., December 23rd, 1805, his father being a farmer. In the spring of the year 1820, when Joseph was a little over fourteen years of age, he became deeply interested in religious matters. He read the pas-

sage in James i. 5 : "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." With full reliance upon that promise in the Divine Word, this humble lad prayed to God and received the heavenly manifestation. He continued faithful, and was instructed by messengers from heaven, and received and brought forth the *Book of Mormon*. When these facts became known to the people in the vicinity where he resided, he was made the object of false and slanderous reports, and severe persecutions. Many attempts were made to kill him, and every device was used to get the plates from him; but the Lord protected him, and people began to believe his testimony. In 1829, John the Baptist came and ordained him to the Aaronic Priesthood. In the same year the Apostles Peter, James and John ordained him to the apostleship.

In obedience to the command of God, the Church of Jesus Christ was once more organized on the earth, with the promise from the Lord that it would never again be taken from among men; that it was restored preparatory to the ushering in of Christ's millennial reign on earth. Some of its members were ordained and sent out to preach. Those who received their testimony and were baptized were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, and the word was confirmed with signs following. The Church rapidly increased in membership, and branches were organized in many of the States. A temple was erected in Kirtland, Ohio. The State of Missouri became the principal place for the gathering of the people; but because they would not join in the practices of the lawless element there, and were believers in an unpopular religion, an organized mob drove them from their habitations, contrary to law, justice, and humanity, to wander on the bleak prairies, in wintry weather, till they left the tracks of their blood on the frozen ground. Men, women and children were subjected to the most fiendish outrages—starved, tortured, butchered. This was in a land that boasted of religious freedom and tolerance!

Finally, about twelve thousand who had escaped the exterminating order of Missouri's mob found a resting-place in Illinois, and built up the beautiful city of Nauvoo. But the refuge was only temporary, for the bigot and the criminal united in a relentless and bloody warfare upon them. Less than six years after their expulsion from Missouri, their Prophet was assassinated in Carthage jail, while in the hands of the officers of the law, and under the pledged protection of the governor of the State, Thomas Ford. This was on June 27, 1844. Joseph Smith had committed no offence; he was guilty of no wrong. "The law cannot reach him, but powder and ball shall!" was the cry of his murderers. The blood of the martyred prophet and his fellow-religionists still cries to God for vengeance!

The enemies of the Saints, however, were doomed to disappointment, for the death of the prophet did not stop the work, or break up the Church organization. The leadership devolved on the Twelve Apostles, with Brigham Young as their President; even greater energy was dis-

played than before, and the temple at Nauvoo was soon completed. Fiendish plots were laid, and barbarous plans adopted to blacken the character of the "Mormon" people, and make them appear abominable in the eyes of the public. Numerous atrocities were committed by the mobocrats, who falsely attributed them to the Saints, and thus aroused public indignation against them.

Hoping to secure immunity from these unjustifiable attacks, they consented to move from the State, the mob agreeing to allow them to remain in peace a given time, so the exodus could be accomplished. This agreement was soon disregarded by the persecutors, who were reckless, and impatient to despoil the Saints. When a portion of the latter had left Nauvoo, the remnant was attacked by an armed force, and driven into Iowa in a destitute condition. General Thomas L. Kane, of Philadelphia, who passed that way a few days afterward, related his experience in a lecture before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The following is an extract from his address: "Dreadful, indeed, was the suffering of these forsaken beings; bowed and cramped by cold and sunburn, alternating as each weary day and night dragged on, they were, almost all of them, the crippled victims of disease. They were there because they had no homes, nor hospital, nor poor-house, nor friends to offer them any. They could not satisfy the feeble cravings of their sick; they had not bread to quiet the fractious hunger-cries of their children. Mothers and babes, daughters and grandparents, all of them alike, were bivouacked in tatters, wanting even covering to comfort those whom the sick shivers of fever were searching to the marrow. These were Mormons, famishing in Lee County, Iowa, in the fourth week of the month of September, in the year of our Lord 1846. The city—it was Nauvoo, Illinois. The Mormons were the owners of that city, and the smiling country around. And those who had stopped their ploughs, who had silenced their hammers, their axes, their shuttles, and their workshop wheels; those who had put out their fires, who had eaten their food, spoiled their orchards, and trampled under foot their thousands of acres of unharvested bread—these were the keepers of their dwellings, the carousers in their temple, whose drunken riot insulted the ears of their dying."

Out into the trackless American wilds, into an Indian country, the "Mormons" wended their way, weary and destitute, for more than fifteen hundred miles, their pathway being marked by the graves of their dead. The history of their privations and sufferings is harrowing in the extreme. The lives of not less than a thousand of their number were sacrificed in the relentless persecutions connected with the exodus from Illinois. But God opened their way, and as a result of their unity, humility and faith through severe tribulations and deep sorrows, they were guided to a refuge in the valley of the Great Salt Lake. Three years later, in 1850, Congress created the Territory of Utah. Under the territorial form of government, the governor, secretary, marshals, postmasters, election and

other territorial officers are appointed by the President of the United States.

In their new home, the Saints increased in numbers, and were beginning to enjoy some of the comforts of life as a reward of their toil, when, in 1857, the national government was induced, through the misrepresentations of some of its officials, to send an army against the "Mormons," who prepared for another exodus, and to defend themselves. But the time required in such an undertaking gave the government an opportunity to discover that it had been misled, and to change its course. The record of the expedition, with its expense of \$37,000,000, stands as a monument of the folly of judging a matter hastily.

The current of popular opinion, however, had set in strongly against the Saints, and it is difficult to change it; but the majority of those with whom they are now in contact are not the lawless element of Missouri and Illinois, so that the violence of former times is no longer used against the body of the people where they are known. But the adverse feeling has caused legislation hostile to them. One feature of their religion that has been attacked is plurality of wives. Now that they have contested the question legally to the highest court in the land, where the decision has been unfavourable to them, they bow to the law, content to leave the issue between the nation that has raised its hand against them, and the God of Israel, in whose justice, mercy, and omnipotence they have perfect confidence. Their Church property has also been seized by the government—property which was the voluntary gift of Church members, for the support of the poor, the building of temples to the Lord, and similar purposes.

PRESENT CONDITION.

The results of the industry, integrity and thrift of the Saints, as shown by their present condition, are a complete refutation of the accusations of evil made against them. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. Utah, the chief centre of their gathering place, has a population of about 210,000, seventy-five per cent. being "Mormons." Ninety per cent. of the heads of families live in their own houses and on their own lands. The fruitful orchards, rich fields and farms, successful industries, and beautiful cities, towns and villages, present to the view a paradise upon earth; while the vigour and cheerfulness of old and middle-aged and young betoken the health, prosperity and happiness which are God's own gifts to this people, in whose hearts dwells more abundantly than in those of any other community that love of God and of their own fellow-men which is the fruit of a pure and noble life in the service of the great Creator.

Not alone in Utah do the Latter-day Saints find a home. Their hundreds of settlements bedeck the mountain valleys from the province of Alberta, in Canada, through Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico in the United States, to Chihuahua,

in Old Mexico, on either side of a line which reaches fifteen hundred miles along the backbone of the American continent.

As an ecclesiastical organization, the first officers in the Church are divinely commissioned apostles of the Lord Jesus, and divine authority is possessed by the whole body of priesthood, down to the office of deacon. Almost the entire male membership of the Church is included in this classification; while there are organizations for women and children. About three hundred districts, or wards, are united in larger organizations, called Stakes of Zion, all combining in a perfect system.

FUTURE DESTINY.

The Saints have an abiding faith in the future glorious destiny of the work in which they are engaged. From its inception there has been steady and rapid progress. Its elders have carried the glad tidings to the nations as God has given them strength. They have not preached for money nor divined for hire. Freely they have received; freely they give. Persecution has followed those who have obeyed the Gospel, just as it did anciently. But with each wave of adversity the Church has grown stronger, and its opponents have been restricted in their ability to inflict injuries on its members. Each successive blow of its foes has fallen more lightly than the one which preceded it; while the Saints have been brightened and made better by the experience gained in drawing nearer to the Lord. No Latter-day Saint has any doubt of the ultimate triumph of the principles he has received in the Gospel. They form the plan of life, the power of God unto salvation. The Church is organized never again to be overcome. Its destiny is to continue to increase until its Founder and Head, the Lord Jesus Christ, will establish His eternal Kingdom, and righteousness shall rule from the rivers to the ends of the earth.

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE.

The purpose of the Gospel is to lead us back to God, improved by the knowledge and experience we have gained. There is no truth in any department of life that is without its pale; no knowledge that is beyond its reach. Its truth is the sum of all existence, the knowledge of things that have been, that are, and that will be. God is truth, and His Gospel is the plan whereby we may be saved in His presence. This is the doctrine that our Lord and Saviour taught; this is the message given to the Latter-day Saints, and which they proclaim to the world. They call upon all men to repent and do the will of God. They invite sincere seekers after truth everywhere. They present to the world an example of the marvellous power of the Gospel they have obeyed. By their fruits they show its effects. They have solved the problem of a happy, prosperous, and contented life, free from sin and sorrow, from poverty and idleness, from hatred and hypocrisy. They present to the rest of mankind the example

of a people who put into practice their belief in being honest, industrious, true, chaste, benevolent, and in doing good to all men. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report, or praiseworthy, they seek after those things.

To all men they bear the message of the Gospel which has made them thus. They leave no room for deceit and delusion. They claim to have divine authority and divine principles, and they offer the proof, which is in the reach of every true, honest, virtuous man and woman. It is the test which the Lord has commanded them to proffer to mankind, the same that He applied to Himself: "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of Myself" (John vii. 16, 17).

There can be no mistake about it, for if it be not of God, He will not give the knowledge. But tens of thousands of Latter-day Saints bear witness that they have received the testimony from Him. It is true, and we bear you witness now of its truth. Hereby we know that we know Him, that we keep His commandments. The Apostle John says: "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 John 9-11).

That we do bring this doctrine, and that it is true, is the testimony which we now give, and which we will meet before the pleasing bar of the Great Jehovah, the eternal Judge of both quick and dead. And may the grace of God the Father, whose throne is high in the heavens, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who sitteth on the right hand of His power until all things shall become subject unto Him, be and abide for ever with those who seek to serve Him in spirit and in truth. Amen.

THE JEWS IN MODERN TIMES. .

BY PROFESSOR D. W. MARKS

(*Chief Minister, West London Synagogue of British Jews*).

IN the lecture I am to deliver, on "The Jews in Modern Times," I start from the period of the Reformation. This important event, with its outburst of intellectual life and its diffusion of new ideas, failed to accomplish in any appreciable degree the alleviation of the status of the Jews of Continental Europe. Their social condition continued intolerable in Protestant, no less than in Roman Catholic, countries—despite the liberal professions of the former, and their loud blast of the right of private judgment. The shedding of their blood had ceased, but they continued still objects of scorn and contempt, and their persecution became even more systematic than in past ages. Nothing was offered them but baptism, and none but the baptized were considered to be within the pale of humanity. In Germany, Austria, and Poland, where they were located in large numbers, they were excluded from all social intercourse, as well as from scientific and industrial pursuits. The darkness of the fourteenth century rested on them long after the first half of the eighteenth century had passed away. Their schools had fallen into decay, their synagogues were hung with the drapery of mourning and despair, and their pulpits were well-nigh mute. To them Europe's science was alien, and Europe's Christianity an abomination. They had imbibed a positive aversion for the language and the alphabets of their tyrants and oppressors, and their ordinary language was a miserable jargon known by the name of *Jüdisch-Deutsch*.

At last, however, came relief, and the spirit of modern civilization began to breathe on their petrified forms of social and spiritual life, and to awaken the dormant powers of their mind. When the hour struck for Germany to throw off the dust of barbarism and to proclaim a more human age, Israel aroused himself from his lethargy; and his national civilization, which had never become extinct, revived under the genial influence of the times. Amongst those of Christian sympathizers may be mentioned Councillor von Dohm and the renowned Lessing; but all the phenomena of that stirring period centred in one man, Moses Mendelssohn, one of the messengers sent by Providence into the world when the time had come "to divide the light from the darkness." He had already attained to eminence as a philosopher and had even successfully disputed the prize with Kant. He now resolved to devote his life to the absorbing object of lifting his brethren in faith out of their social decrepitude and of putting an end to

their isolation in thought and feeling from the rest of mankind. He appealed to them by the voice of their cherished Scriptures—a voice to which in all their tribulations they had never been dull—and the lever on which he relied was that of education. As the Jews were then ignorant of the German alphabet, he was driven to adopt in his classical German translation of the Bible the square Hebrew character. He opened at Berlin an academy which soon became famous and attracted to its benches many Christian pupils of the highest families for secular instruction. The promiscuous education of Jews and Christians was a bold step in that age of prejudice, but it gave no offence. By degrees the brazen wall, which the antipathies of more than a thousand years had built up, was thrown down, and the hand of mutual fellowship was held out by Christian and Jew. In the presence of the new life mediæval predilections and systems have vanished away, and the Jews have created for themselves new worlds in the realms of civilization, science, and letters. At the present time Jews are to be found in considerable numbers amongst the *savans*, and a large portion of the daily and periodical Press is under their direction.

Now an intellectual change like this could hardly have been brought about without exerting a telling influence on the religious thought and the outward ritual practices of the Jews. The modern cultured Israelite could not mould his mind to the type into which Talmudism had been cast in times when persecution forced the Hebrew race into a state of isolation. Important changes have therefore taken place in the Synagogal economy, as well as in the composition of the prayer-book, which once reflected all the painful reminiscences of a martyred people.

Meanwhile the civil emancipation of the Jews in Germany advanced. In 1812 they obtained the right to engage in industrial pursuits, and with this concession the last of the long list of restrictions, which had driven them to follow the most humble callings, was removed. Later on they were declared citizens and *Ländeskinder*; and at the Congress of Vienna in 1814, a public recognition was made of their patriotic efforts during the War of Independence; and, by an especial article, the Congress pledged itself to secure for them a perfect equality of rights in all the Allied States. It was long, however, before the pledge was redeemed by Germany and Austria. In Russia it remains still unfulfilled.

There is a very large Jewish population in the Austrian dominions, and until very recently their position was a sad one. No one was considered to have a claim to nationality that remained without the pale of the Roman Catholic Church, and numbers of Jews have been forced into an outward profession of the creed of Rome as the only means of being recognized as citizens and of securing industrial employment. But the battle of Sadowa wrought a great change in the government and accomplished wonders for the rights of conscience. Religious opinion is now perfectly free, and no stain attaches to dissent from the Established Church. Most of the Jews who had gone over to it have come back to the Synagogue, bringing with

them occasionally persons of Christian birth, with whom they had formed marriage connections.

The spiritual condition of the Jews in Austria and in Germany is nearly on a par with that of other denominations in those empires. The scepticism of Kant, Hegel, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Fichte, Strauss, and others, has not left the Synagogue, any more than the Church, unscathed. The Jews of the Continent (Russia and Poland excepted) may be divided into two classes, those that *do*, and those that *do not* observe the ceremonies of their religion; very few of the richer classes belong to the former, most of the poorer classes belong to the latter.

Of all European countries where the Jews sought a shelter from their persecutors, Spain was the one where they especially made their mark. Driven out of Palestine soon after the conversion of Constantine, some of them fled to Arabia, some to the Crimea, and most of them to Spain. In South Arabia, and in the opposite coast of Ethiopia, Christians and Jews strove for supremacy. The Himyar Jewish state, eventually succumbed, but some of its chieftains continued independent, and were in possession of their castles at the advent of Mohammed who, at the beginning of his career, desired to make friends with them. The agency of Judaism in the formation of Mohammedanism was quite as important as in the production of Christianity. The views of the world as set forth in the Koran are entirely taken from the Hebrew Scriptures and from the oral traditions.

About the same time a movement began among the Jews in Babylonia, which culminated in a schism. A rabbi, named Anau, imparted form to it, and hence arose what is known as the school of the Karaites, which completely rejected the traditions of the Talmud. The Karaites employed the Arabic language in their polemical treatises, and the Rabbinical Jews soon adopted the same language for controversy and for general theological purposes. It is indeed remarkable that the Jews should never have become familiar with the Persian language, although they lived side by side with the Zoroastrians more than twelve hundred years. The Jews received many religious notions from the Persians, to whom they communicated few, if any, of their own.

About the time of the origin of Karàism, the kingdom of the Chazars was founded on the Caspian, by the fragments of the army of Attila, then on its march back from Europe to Turkistan.¹ The influence of the Chazars whose kings professed the Jewish religion must have been considerable on the surrounding tribes. The Jewish kingdom collapsed in the beginning of the eleventh century. By that time the Jews in Spain had attained a high degree of literary and scientific importance. They stood as mediators between Moslem and Christian, and without them the benefit of Mohammedan literature would never have come within the reach of Christians. They translated works from the Hebrew and Arabic, and these were further translated into Latin. At the head of these literary

¹ See *Gratz's Geschichte*, vol. v.

labours stands Jehudah ibn Tibbon of Granada, who was followed in the same path by his children and grandchildren. Montpellier, Beziers, Arles, Bagnoles, and the neighbouring cities of Spain and Italy furnished able Jewish scholars. Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas Aquinas studied Aristotle in Latin versions, made from the Hebrew.¹ They also produced independent works of their own. The celebrated philosophical work, *Fons Vita*, had been for centuries attributed to a Mohammedan author under the name of *Avicbron*, but by a literary discovery made by the late erudite Dr. Munk, it turned out to be the production of the gifted Solomon ibn Gabirol. It may here be mentioned that the reformation of the Church was influenced by the Jews in two ways: *First*, by the *Kabbala*, which laid a stronghold on the imagination of Christians aspiring to independence of thought. Jews were naturally the interpreters of the Kabbalistic books, but the most effective propagators of the mystic science were Christians. Raymond Lull, Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, Knorr von Rosenroth, and many other minor capacities, wrote for and against the *Kabbala*. *Secondly*, by the revival of Biblical studies which had been almost neglected in the Church since the days of Jerome. For this service the aid of the Jews was indispensable, not only for the purpose of teaching the language, but for opening to the Christian world the stores of Rabbinical literature.

But the sun of prosperity for the Jews in Spain lasted only for a few centuries, from the defeat of the last Gothic king, until the time when the Moorish power was uprooted by the triumph of Ferdinand at Granada. A rigorous persecution followed close on this victory, the Inquisition was established, the axe and the faggot were the doom of all so-called unbelievers, and the Jews who refused to apostatize from their ancestral faith could only escape these penalties by exile. About the same time when Columbus was hoisting sail in search of a new world, upwards of half a million of Jews were cast forth from the land of their birth to encounter all the horrors of banishment and destitution. By far the larger number of them perished—some by shipwreck, some through starvation and fatigue, and not a few fell into the hands of the pirates of Algeria, and closed their lives in the rigour of slavery.

Of those who escaped such perils, many found a shelter in hospitable Holland, where they were suffered to live in comparative ease and to profess outwardly their faith. The gratitude inspired by this humane treatment was singularly displayed by the Jews of Holland when William of Orange was in need of funds to fit out his expedition to England. One of their community placed at the disposal of William two millions of guilders, saying to him: "If you succeed, you will no doubt repay the loan; if you fail, I am well content to lose it in the cause of religious liberty." The interest evinced by the Jewish refugees in the welfare of the country, and their generous support to all its charitable institutions, secured for them the

¹ See Munk, *Milange*, p. 335.

national goodwill, and prepared the way for their complete emancipation. They are very numerous in the Dutch provinces, and amongst them are found at the present day men of European celebrity in every liberal profession and branch of science and literature. They have over sixty schools, authorized by the government, and admirable theological colleges for the training of ministers. Their benevolent institutions are so manifold as to have proved absolutely injurious to self-help and industrial activity. Indiscriminate almsgiving has tended to demoralize the poor, until the irrepressible mendicant of Amsterdam has sunk into the lowest type of the Jewish race. It is not surprising that in the country which gave birth to the renowned Spinoza there should be found amongst the cultured Hebrews men whose religious opinions do not square with the standard of Rabbinism; but the majority of the Dutch Jews are ultra-Talmudical, and their aversion to modify the Synagogue ritual from the stamp it took during the persecution of the middle ages, and to adapt it to the requirements of the time being, has up to the present proved invincible.

France contains upwards of a hundred thousand Jews, and they are remarkable for their staunch patriotism. They differ from their ancestors of a bygone age, in so far as they have lost all feeling for the land of the Patriarchs, and they exult in the exclamation, "*Notre Zion c'est la France*," ignoring completely the old doctrine of a restoration to Palestine. Nor in this respect do they differ much from modern Jews in general, who live at ease and are in the enjoyment of equal rights of citizenship. Just as the Church in the times of its tribulation consoled itself in the belief of the doctrine of the Millennium, so the Synagogue during its dreary centuries of persecution, found comfort in the hope of a restoration to the Holy Land, which was to become a great and glorious kingdom. But just as the majority of Christians suffered the doctrine of the Millennium to recede into the background, when the Church became dominant, so Jews, for the most part, have dealt in modern times with the old teaching of a restoration to Zion.

France may well take credit to itself for having been the first Christian State of Europe that fully carried into effect the principle of liberty of conscience. In 1789 it proclaimed complete emancipation to all its Jewish subjects, and they have repaid the debt by a passionate devotion to all its national interests. The French Jews have won a foremost place in the Senate, at the Bar, as well as in literature, science, and art, and some of them have attained to eminence as members of the government.

Out of the nine millions of Jews spread over the surface of the globe, more than four and a half millions are to be found in Russia, Russian Poland, the States of Barbary, Morocco, and Roumania, where their treatment is a scandal to the civilization of the age. They have no political rights, and they are not even considered within the protection of the law. They are subjected to an exceptional system of government, which grinds them down to heartless and galling exactions.

In all other Continental States, as well as in America and the British Colonies, Jews follow the same pursuits and exhibit the same national character, for good or evil, as their fellows of other creeds. Despite the tenacity of habit, superinduced by centuries of persecution, the effects of which are not thrown off in a few generations, the Jews are powerfully represented in art, in pure and applied science, in *Belles Lettres* and polite literature, in each of which branches every European country derives a portion of its renown from their activity and labour. A peasantry cannot be improvised out of a race which ever since the overthrow of their political nationality have rarely been permitted to handle a plough or to plant a vine. There is nothing, however, incompatible with the qualifications needful for husbandry in the character of a people who, in the palmy days of their political existence, were almost exclusively devoted to agriculture. In Jaffa, Hebron, and other parts of Palestine they are at the present time establishing agricultural colonies, and the hills are beginning to assume something like the appearance of the gardens of olden times, so vividly described in the Songs of Zion. This beneficial movement amongst the Palestinian Hebrews is to be ascribed chiefly to the French Jews, the originators of the "Alliance Israélite," one of the most useful institutions amongst our community in modern times. The Jews of England have heartily participated in the movement, and its spirit has radiated through the primary and industrial schools of Jerusalem, Safet, and other places, into the whole of the social relations of the Palestine Hebrews. Ignorance and pauperism are fast disappearing from amongst them, and they are acquiring modern culture and realizing the first pulsations of active and self-supporting industry.

The modern history of British Jews dates from the year 1655. Banished from the soil of England by the heartless edict of 1279, the Jews had often turned a longing eye to this country, where the laws offered a protection for the oppressed not to be found during the sixteenth century in any other European State. Still, the new spirit breathed into England by the Reformation gave little hope of the repeal of the cruel edict against the disciples of Moses. From Oliver Cromwell, whose memory should be dear to all lovers of religious freedom, came the first faint expression of sympathy for the persecuted race. In 1655 he suffered it to be made known, to a few eminent merchants of Amsterdam, that he entertained no personal objection to the re-admission of the Jews into England, and that, in as far as related to himself, they would find in him an advocate rather than an opponent. This was enough to induce some of the Jews of the Netherlands to depute the famous Rabbi Manasseh ben Israel to proceed to London and to plead before the Privy Council for the revocation of Edward I.'s decree of banishment. Cromwell advocated it in a speech of remarkable power, but he failed to overcome the rancorous prejudices of his Council, and Manasseh returned home after what appeared to have been a fruitless expedition. Relying, however, on the personal goodwill

of Cromwell, a few families from Amsterdam and The Hague made their way to London, and were soon joined by other emigrants, until they found themselves in 1656 in numbers sufficient to establish a synagogue. They encountered a fierce opposition, especially from the merchants of the City, and, as they had no legal sanction for their settlement in England, many petitions were presented to Parliament for their expulsion. The death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658 deprived them of a warm friend and sympathizer, but the conflict which arose under Richard Cromwell amongst the democratic leaders so completely engrossed the public mind that little heed was paid to the return of the Jews. In 1664 the old spirit of fanaticism revived with accelerated force, and the Jews were so maltreated by the mob that they had to petition the Government for the protection of their persons and their property. Their religious creed was regarded as a misdemeanour by the bulk of the population, and the Protestant clergy consigned them to a moral and social quarantine. They were made to feel that if England gave them for the time being an abiding place, it was far from affording them a home. It was no uncommon thing to arrest their merchants in the Royal Exchange, under the Statute of the 23rd Elizabeth, as "Relapsed Popish Recusants."

In 1723 they were for the first time formally recognised by Parliament by an Act enabling them to take the oath of abjuration without the words, "On the true faith of a Christian," a concession that seemed to indicate a softening of prejudice. In 1755 the Government carried through Parliament a Bill for the naturalization of British-born Jews, in recognition of their patriotic efforts to save the country from bankruptcy during the perilous rebellion in 1745. But scarcely had the session closed when a wild agitation arose throughout the land for the repeal of the Act, and the Government, yielding to the popular clamour, carried its repeal in the following session of Parliament. The late Sir Robert Peel, in a speech on the repeal of the Acts which excluded the Jews from sitting as members of the Legislature, described the repeal of the Bill of 1755 as the most shameful deed ever perpetrated by Parliament. This strong manifestation indicated the rough husk of bigotry that still adhered to the bulk of the English people, and that the bent of its spirit was evidently towards intolerance. The Jews were so completely cowed by the event of 1756, that for more than three generations they confined themselves to their "Goshen" in the east of London, without mixing with any but the members of their own faith except for the purpose of business transactions. They were timid about committing themselves again to a movement for the amelioration of their condition, which might produce sectarian strife, and arouse a spirit of rancour like that of which they had heard their fathers tell and lament.

The first quarter of the present century had nearly run its course when the London merchants gave evidence of the dawn of a more humane feeling towards Jews, by enabling them to become Freemen of the City.

Still they laboured under many exceptional disabilities, and to remove these, Mr., afterwards Sir, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, devoted all the energies of his capacious mind, and the most invincible perseverance. But it was hopeless to attempt to abrogate the penal laws against the Jews so long as the more powerful bodies of Dissenters and Roman Catholics were labouring under similar exclusions. Still the grievance of which the Jews had so long complained, of being deprived of the benefit of a University education, was felt to be so intolerable as to demand an immediate remedy. The poet, Thomas Campbell, had suggested the idea of starting a university apart from theology and every kind of religious test, and Mr. Goldsmid seized with delight the suggestion. He devoted to the project a considerable sum, and engaged in the undertaking the powerful support of Brougham, Hume, Warburton, and other advanced Liberals. Hence the establishment of University College, which has exercised an appreciable influence on the progress of education; and to it may be traced the larger views and the wider sympathies that have since found their way into the chartered Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Before the foundation of University College, no career was open to the aspiring Israelite but that of commerce; and the mental superiority which that race has displayed ever since a field has been afforded it excites a feeling of regret that many a powerful intellect amongst the Jews should have been suffered to stagnate during ages of exclusiveness, for lack of opportunity for cultivation.

Jewish hope revived in 1828, when Lord John Russell carried through the House of Commons the repeal of the Test and Corporations Acts, but the Episcopal Bench in the House of Lords would pass the Bill only on the condition of the insertion of the words, "On the true faith of a Christian," as a part of the declaration on acceptance of office. The passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829, renewed the hope of the Jews that their complete emancipation was at hand. But preliminary measures had to precede its realization.

In 1847 the election of David Salomons as Alderman of the City led to the passing of an Act enabling him and others of his faith elected to municipal office to omit from the required declaration words to which they could not conscientiously subscribe. Soon followed the election of Baron Lionel de Rothschild as member for the City of London, and then the question of the complete emancipation of the Jews was brought within the range of practical politics. For eleven long years a contest was maintained on this question between the two Houses of Parliament; but in 1858 it was settled by a proposal of compromise made by the Earl of Lucan, and the last of the civil disabilities which had so long stained the statute-book was removed.

During the last quarter of a century the Anglo-Jewish community has advanced with rapid strides. Many things have combined for their improvement, but no factor has been so potent as that of education. Whilst

University College has conferred priceless benefits on the upper classes, and sent forth men who have shed lustre on their *Alma Mater*, the renowned school in Bell Lane, Spitalfields, continues to instruct three thousand poor children at an annual cost of £12,000. Other schools of less magnitude exist in different parts of the Metropolis. The improvement of the lower classes wrought by these institutions is very remarkable. The educational reports, furnished from time to time by the Government inspectors, show that of all religious denominations in England, the Jews have proportionally the smallest number who are destitute of the common franchise of reading and writing. The troops of Hebrew boys which, a quarter of a century ago, infested the public thoroughfares as vendors of articles of small value, and the young men that assailed the public ear with the incessant cry of "Old Clo'," have quite disappeared from the scene; and they are succeeded by a generation that takes to more elevating and productive callings at home, or in the colonies, where they have become prosperous. Mendicity still prevails to a considerable extent in the community, owing to foreign emigrants expatriated from Russia and Germany, and they resort for the most part to London as a fancied El Dorado. Much interesting information, bearing on this hard social problem, is supplied in the periodical reports of the Jewish Board of Guardians.

Throughout Great Britain and Ireland there are more than ninety thousand Jews, by far the larger portion of whom are located in London and its suburbs, whilst the city of New York alone is said to contain one hundred thousand of the Hebrew community. They are remarkably free from predatory acts and deeds of violence, and they are strictly law-abiding. Intemperance is a failing rarely found amongst them, but the lower classes are much given to gambling. Until recently the prevailing feature amongst the poor Jewesses was chastity, but it is less strictly maintained at present, the mania for fine attire is the cause of the fall of not a few.

In matters of religious faith and practice the British Jews cling to the code of Moses, unshaken amidst the changes and the turmoil of ages, and they recognise in the Synagogue a living organism. Some of their ritual observances have naturally yielded to modifications, motivated by time, locality, and circumstance. They draw a line of distinction between the matter and the manner, the essence and the accident, the spirit and the form, or, in other words, between outward and inward religion. They regard Judaism from its practical, and not from its speculative, standpoint. It is to them what the Germans call a *Religion der That*, and it resolves itself into what Scripture charges them to do and to refrain from doing. Indeed, Judaism is remarkably free from dogmatism, and is essentially a religion of action. It emphatically repudiates the doctrine of exclusive salvation, a doctrine that has produced so much persecution and bloodshed in the world. It likewise discountenances every attempt to suppress the critical spirit, and to paralyze the intellect, to stigmatize honest doubt

or error as guilt, and to elevate dogma above the moral element of religion. Influenced by the endless variety of human opinions, and maintained by all with equal honesty, confidence, and hope, Judaism holds and teaches that no one can be distant from God "whose life is in the right." This is not a sudden outcome of Jewish sentiment prompted by modern liberalism, but is as old as the Bible itself. The same Voice that promulgated the Decalogue at Sinai proclaimed that, "on every place where the Divine name should be recorded, a blessing from above would descend." Again, at the inauguration of the Temple at Jerusalem, Solomon placed the non-Israelite on precisely the same level as the Hebrew with respect to the acceptance of prayer. Even in times of sore persecution from the Crescent and the Cross, when the bitterness of the hour might have called forth a hostile or anti-social utterance, the Rabbins openly taught that "salvation is the heritage of the virtues of all peoples." Religious teachers there have been, and are still, who profess their incapability to conceive how any but one measure of belief, and one stereotyped form of worship can be acceptable to the Almighty. But here the Jew finds no perplexity, since he recognises in the very variety of prevailing opinions and forms a telling evidence of the righteousness of God, who judges between the errors of the head, if errors they be, and the errors of the heart.

The Jew, therefore, does not classify men by the principle of theology. He regards the severity practised towards the Canaanites of old not as a consequence of erroneous religious belief, but as a retribution for their revolting and unnatural crimes, which were inseparable from their religious practice. The Egyptians and the Edomites were also idolaters; but as they did not associate their worship with the abominations of Canaan, the Jews were charged to regard them as brothers, and to promote their welfare. Though Judaism is a missionary religion yet, paradoxical as it may seem, it is very adverse to proselytism. Conversion was practised by them so long as the Bible existed in the Hebrew version only, and was inaccessible to the outer world; but in our times, when the Scriptures are rendered into every language and dialect of the globe, and each individual can read and interpret them for himself, Jews do not hold it incumbent to organize a propaganda, nor to intrude their views on the consciences of others. The mission of the Jews, as imposed by their legislator, lay through their personal conduct and example.

It is an error to suppose that Jews regard Christianity with anything like a hostile sentiment. They naturally distinguish between Christianity in its infancy, which rested altogether on a *moral* basis, and the Christianity of a later period, when its moral conceptions became materialized by the influence of metaphysical dogma. Still, inasmuch as in its present qualified phase it continues to embody and teach the fundamental ethics of the code of Sinai, Jews esteem it as one of the means for disseminating in the world the essential principles of morality and civilization. On this account

the Jew has no conscientious scruple in granting plots of land on his estate, or in contributing in other ways for the building of churches and chapels of all denominations. A sense of social duty, no less than the feeling that property has its obligations as well as its rights, prompts him to make some provision for the spiritual needs of his tenantry.

I venture, in conclusion, to offer a bald remark or two on a subject with respect to which the Synagogue differs very widely in its teaching from that of the Church, and that is on the doctrine of Messianism, or what is called in Evangelical phrase "the coming of the kingdom of heaven." In the cheering and elevating homilies of the prophets of Judah, a touching picture is drawn of an ideal human happiness and of a state of social perfection made manifest by a higher life in every child of God. It exhibits humanity as no longer restricted by the limitations of country, race, or tribe, and all contention, social no less than sectarian, giving place to gentleness and concord. The differences of religious belief, and the varying forms of its outward expression, are to be consigned to the past, and there is to be one common house of prayer, where all are to meet and join in praise to the Universal Father. Many are the vicissitudes through which the Jewish race has passed, but never has this grand, prophetic ideal been extinguished from their hopes nor ceased to be rehearsed in the liturgy of the Synagogue. The more troublous the age, the more hostile the fanaticism waxed, the closer the Jews clung to the hope that persecution would gradually wear itself out, although its spirit might flicker at intervals, and that the crowning scene of the Messianic drama would realize the Psalmist's prediction of "Mercy and truth meeting together, and righteousness and peace being locked in fond embrace."

The idea finds its most intense expression in the Apocalyptic books of Daniel, Enoch, Sirach, and the Sybelline leaves, all of which date upwards from about the year 170 before the Christian era. Now the Church, as it seems to us Jews, holds this Messianic era to have come, and to have found its realization, in part at least, in the advent of the renowned Teacher whom it recognises as the predicted Messiah of the Hebrew Scriptures. From such a conclusion Jewish sentiment totally dissents. It seems to the disciples of the Synagogue something like a moral paradox to assimilate the condition which the world has continued to exhibit with the glorious epoch prophesied by the seers of Judah, and it must be borne in mind that the Hebrew Bible speaks of one Messianic advent only, and not of two advents. It should not, therefore, excite surprise that Jews cannot persuade themselves that the promised total cessation of strife and war, the perfection of human happiness, and the union of all hearts and minds has already been realized, and that the glorious Messianic epoch has found its ideal in the form of "a man of sorrows."

Jews, therefore, look to the future for the realization of the Messianic promises, and, committing their accomplishment to the time-working providence of the Eternal One, they feel it a duty to respect the different

systems of denominations of religion, whilst they remain true to their own, giving practical effect to the words of the seer, Micah: "Let all others adhere to their creed and worship, and let us walk in the name of our God for ever and ever."

We feel that He whose mandate all nature obeys, He whose providence over the destinies of Israel is as manifest to-day as it has been in every phase of our exceptional history, may well enlist our confidence to accomplish, through the Abrahamic race, the Messianic regeneration, and to make Israel the instrument for advancing spiritual truth and moral development, until they attain the climax of healing all sectarian and social differences, and in bringing all men to worship at one common altar, when all that is base shall give place to what is exalted in thought and sublime in action. The Greek poets taught that a golden age such as this had come and gone. The Jewish prophets assigned it to a distant future, and in the future alone can Jews find any appreciable meaning of "Messiah's Advent" and "the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven."

JEWISH ETHICS.

BY THE REV. MORRIS JOSEPH.

THE final aim of religion is morality. This is the central truth of Judaism. In this respect Jewish doctrine differs from Hinduism, which makes ritual purity and spiritual ecstasy the *summum bonum*, from the religion of Islam, whose first and last word is "Allah is God, and Mohammed is His Prophet," from Christianity, which sets faith above works, and declares belief to be the condition precedent to salvation. In every stage of its development Judaism has taught that faith and ritual are but the paths to righteousness, and that far higher than obedience to the ceremonial law, higher even than the possession of theological truth, is purity of heart and holiness of life.

The keynote of this exalted teaching is struck by the Pentateuch itself. "Ye shall be holy," the Israelite is admonished in the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus; "for I, the Lord your God, am holy."¹ And the typical precept which is used to illustrate this general formula is a purely ethical one: "Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father."² Certainly, this specific maxim is immediately followed in its turn by a law relating to sacrifice; but of the many precepts contained in this one chapter, so large a majority deal with morals, that it is impossible to doubt that it is conduct, and not ritual, upon which the Lawgiver would lay the chief stress.³ Similarly, the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus contains the injunction: "Ye shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, which if a man do he shall live by them; I am the Lord."⁴ And, as the succeeding passage indicates, these statutes, by doing which man is to live, are those which aim at the suppression of sensuality and vice.

Elsewhere the Pentateuch plainly indicates the value of the sacrificial rite. It is the means, not the end—useful as an expression of inward emotion, useless if it be disjoined from rectitude of life. Before the sin-offering can be brought the sinner must confess his transgression—nay, more, if he has stolen, he must make restitution.⁵ It is only when he has done this that his sacrifice is accepted, and he may count on being forgiven. And the theme is taken up by prophet and psalmist: "The sacrifices of God are a contrite spirit."⁶ If sinners would be at one with their Father in Heaven, they must rend their hearts and not their garments;⁷ if they would have their prayers answered, they must "cease to

¹ Lev. xix. 2.

² *Ibid.*, 3.

³ See Midrash Rabboh on the Passage.

⁴ Lev. xviii. 5.

⁵ Lev. v. 5; vi. 4; Num. v. 7.

⁶ Ps. li. 17.

⁷ Joel ii. 13.

do evil," they must "seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow";¹ if their fasting is to be effective, they must loose the bonds of wickedness, and let the oppressed go free.² No wonder, then, that in their sublime pictures of the Golden Age, the prophets of Israel find no place for ceremonial religion. The gracious figures of Peace and Righteousness and Brotherly Love monopolize the canvas. In the last days God is to judge between many peoples, and reprove strong nations afar off; "and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."³ And in yet another passage describing the universal peace which is to sway men's hearts in the good time that is coming, it is figuratively declared that "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."⁴

It is true that one element in this glorious dream is that the knowledge of God will overflow the whole earth with its life-giving waters; but the manifestations and results of that knowledge are to consist in the perfect peace, the confident trust in each other's goodness, which is to reign among men. According to the prophet Jeremiah, indeed, the knowledge of the Lord is but another name for acts of righteousness and love. "Did not thy father," he reminds the wicked king of Judah, "do judgment and justice? He judged the cause of the poor and needy. Was not this to know Me? saith the Lord."⁵ Let him who would boast, elsewhere, exclaims the same prophet in the name of God, glory not in his power or his riches, but "in understanding and knowing Me, that I am the Lord that exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; or in these things I delight, saith the Lord."⁶

So, too, the Talmud declares in its turn that "humility supersedes all the sacrifices."⁷ "He who devotes himself to the mere study of religion," it continues, "without engaging in works of mercy and love, is like one who has no God."⁸ Religious contemplation, it teaches further, is commendable only when it goes hand in hand with active morality. "Only the union of the two can make sin forgotten."⁹ "The aim of wisdom," it says again, is "amendment and good deeds."¹⁰ Bachya, a famous Jewish teacher of the eleventh century, in his "Duties of the Heart,"¹¹ compares the Scriptures to a ball of silk composed of threads of three different qualities. The historical passages are lowest in the scale of value; next comes the ceremonial law; last and highest of all are the spiritual and moral truths. Even Maimonides,¹² though, under the influence of Aristotle,

¹ Isa. i. 17.² *Ibid.*, lviii. 6.³ Micah iv. 3, 4; compare Isa. ii. 4.⁴ Isa. xi. 6-9.⁵ Jer. xxii. 15, 16.⁶ *Ibid.*, ix. 23, 24.⁷ *Sotah*, 5b.⁸ *Abodah Zarah*, 16b.⁹ *Aboth*, ii. 2.¹⁰ *Berachot*, 17a.¹¹ At the end of the Introduction.¹² 12th century. #

he makes the philosophic life the highest good, joins with it, as part of the ideal, that knowledge of God which is, in effect, but a synonym for all the virtues.¹

Nor is it only obedience to the ceremonial law or the attainment of spiritual calm which, according to Judaism, is surpassed by moral excellence. The right conduct of everyday life transcends in importance even right belief. Theology must yield the first place to morals. More than once the Biblical writers epitomize the whole duty of man, and the summary in every case is either mainly or exclusively ethical. Need I remind you of Psalm xv., where the ideal man—he who is worthy to dwell in God's holy hill—is described as he that walketh uprightly, that speaketh the truth in his heart, that slandereth not with his tongue, that despiseth the vile, that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not? Or need I quote the fine saying of Micah?²—"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Hillel, the great Talmudic sage, who preceded Jesus by some seventy years, also gives a summary of the Israelite's duty. To the heathen who asks to be taught Judaism while he stands on one foot, he replies, "What is displeasing to thee do not to thy fellow-man; this is the whole law, the rest is but commentary."³ "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—this, another Rabbin—Akiba—in a similar spirit, declares to be the very quintessence of Jewish teaching.⁴ Yet a third sage finds the vital principle of Judaism in the words, "This is the book of the generations of Adam"⁵—a passage which, affirming the common brotherhood of all mankind, teaches that the moral law should be as wide as humanity.⁶ And finally, as though to express in the most striking manner the extent to which rectitude of life towers above mere belief, the Talmud affirms that the heathen who observes the moral law is the equal of the high priest,⁷ and that every good man, no matter what his creed may be, is sure of Heaven.⁸ The old, much-misunderstood Rabbins, then, were clearly at one with Pope:

"For modes of faith let graces, each its right;
It is can't be wrong whose life is in the right."⁹

You will not conclude, of course, that Judaism is nothing but a collection of moral axioms, or that the Jews are simply a society for ethical culture. Judaism without a creed would obviously be a contradiction in terms—an impossibility. It is superfluous to insist upon this point when the Bible, which, from beginning to end, is one long sermon about God, lies open before you all. Every teacher in Israel has necessarily emphasized the importance of belief both as an embodiment of the truth and as

¹ For a masterly analysis of Maimonides' ethical system see "Die Ethik des Maimonides," by Dr. David Rosin (Breslau: 1876).

² Micah vi. 8.

³ Sabbath, 31a.

⁴ Siphrah, *Kedoshim*, iv. 12.

⁵ Gen. v. 1.

⁶ Siphrah, *Kedoshim*, iv. 12.

⁷ Baba Kama, 33a. ⁸ Synhedrin, 105a. Compare Maimonides: Hillel Teshubah, iii. 5.

⁹ Essay on Man, iii. 305.

a powerful stimulus and support to moral effort. But, while Judaism declares that faith is the essential basis of ethics, it makes ethics and not faith the ultimate goal. The Psalmist¹ sets the Lord continually before him, but only because he knows that when God is at his right hand he will not be moved—his moral stability will be assured. "Acknowledge Him," cries the wise man in Proverbs, "in all thy ways, and He will make thy paths straight."² But the straightening of the path, the life that is "in the right," is the chief thing to be desired. The whole truth is pithily summed up by the Talmud: "Without religion there can be no true morality; without morality there can be no true religion."³

Let us now attempt to catch a glimpse—though, owing to the vast extent of the subject it must necessarily be a very imperfect glimpse—of the nature of that moral teaching which occupies so large a place in the Jewish system. The very highest standard of conduct is laid down—the very noblest motive is appealed to. "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy." In striving after righteousness the Israelite is to set before his eyes a Divine ideal. The ways of God to man are to be the type of what the ways of men to each other should be. God "doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye, therefore, the stranger."⁴ Nor is this imitation of God the sole incentive held out. The command to be holy since God is holy, includes also a warning against a moral degradation which snaps the links that bind man, who is created in the Divine image, to his Maker. Through moral impurity, as well as through physical uncleanness, the Divine Presence, which is in the midst of the camp, is banished, and God turns away from the transgressor. No more powerful expression can be found for the disturbance of the relations between man and his Creator than that which declares that God hides His face from the sinner.⁵ And just as transgression estranges the guilty one from his heavenly Father, so to repent is to go back to Him—to be united with Him again—to mend the links that iniquity has broken. "Return, O Israel, unto the Lord thy God, for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity."⁶ It would be impossible to conceive a more forcible or more beautiful description of the debasement wrought by sin, or of the ennoblement which penitence is to achieve.

God, then, is to be the pattern by which men are to shape their lives, estrangement from Him—a falling away from the high standard of purity He is ever setting them—the one great consequence of wrongdoing which is to act as their chief deterrent. And thus we are face to face with the motives to which Judaism appeals in its exhortations to virtue. John Stuart Mill charges Religion with pandering to men's self-interest, to the neglect of those nobler aspirations which it should be its aim to arouse and

¹ Ps. xvi. 8.² Prov. iii. 6.³ Aboth, iii. 21.⁴ Deut. x. 18, 19. Compare Siphre on Deut. xi. 22.⁵ *Ibid.*, xxxi. 18 xxxii. 20; Isa. i. 15. ⁶ Hosea xiv. 1. Compare Deut. iv. 30, xxx. 2.

develop.¹ It is not a fair accusation. The Pentateuch promises worldly recompense to the worldly-minded—to the spiritually youthful, whom the picture of comparatively sordid delights alone can influence. But it does not forget the nobler spirits whom the admonition to love God with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their might, suffices to kindle with an enthusiasm for duty.² This love of God, which is at once the inspiration and the exceeding great reward of the good man, becomes, notably in the case of the Psalmist, an all-absorbing passion. It manifests itself in the rapture with which he ponders the Divine commands. "O how I love thy law," he cries; "it is my meditation all the day long."³ The same single-hearted devotion is expressed again in that rejoicing in the Lord, of which the Psalms are full. "Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God, my exceeding joy."⁴ It is a joy, too, which the storms of life cannot quench, which, because it is independent of worldly recompense, survives the most searching trials and disasters. "Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls: Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation,"⁵ In like manner the Talmud, despite its frequent references to the bliss of Eternal Life, does not omit to warn us that the highest form of duty is that which is performed for its own sake, without thought of recompense. "Be not like servants that serve the master for wages; let your motive be only reverence for heaven."⁶ The good man, the Rabbins further teach, finds his supreme delight in the Divine commands themselves, not in thinking of the reward that obedience will bring.⁷

A distinguishing characteristic of Jewish ethical teaching is its reasonableness and moderation. It is marked by no excess, no extravagance. It demands nothing that is impossible for the individual, nothing that is inconsistent with the well-being, nay, the existence, of society. Something more than mere almsgiving, which is too often self-pity masquerading in the garb of mercy, is recommended by the Pentateuch. Careful study of the condition and real needs of the poor—a rarer and more difficult task—this is expressly enjoined. The rich, according to Deuteronomy,⁸ are to open their hand, not for the purpose of giving mere doles, but of lending the poor man "sufficient for his need." And notice that lending rather than giving is here recommended. The self-respect of the deserving poor is not to be wounded in the attempt to rob poverty of its sting. Similarly the Talmud declares that loans are preferable to almsgiving,⁹ and Maimonides, in distinguishing the merits of various benevolent deeds, assigns the highest place to those considerate acts which aim at destroying pauperism, and restoring to the poor their lost independence.¹⁰

¹ See his Essay on the "Utility of Religion." ² Deut. vi. 5. ³ Ps. cxiv. 97.
⁴ Ps. xliii. 4. ⁵ Hab. iii. 17, 18. ⁶ Aboth, i. 3. ⁷ Abodah Zarah, 17b.
⁸ Deut. xv. 8. ⁹ Sabbath, 63a. ¹⁰ Hilec. Mat. Aniyim, x. 7-14.

But, while there is no virtue more highly appraised, or more frequently commended, than benevolence, it is the benevolence that is not exercised at the expense of any other virtue. If mercy ought to season justice, justice ought equally to season mercy. The cry of the oppressed, we are warned, sounds loudest in God's ear;¹ but the judge is cautioned not to favour the poor man out of regard for his poverty.² "Justice, justice, shalt thou pursue;"³—and the command is the keystone of the entire fabric of the social ethics taught by the Bible.⁴

In short, Jewish ethical teaching is singularly free from mere sentimentalism.⁵ Virtues are commended, not because they are intrinsically beautiful, but because they either ennoble the character or add to the common stock of human happiness. *Æstheticism* as the basis of morals is a notion which the Jew left to the ancient philosophers; a maudlin, hysterical morality he leaves to some more modern folks. His is a healthy, a robust, a practical ethic. Meekness that takes the form of useless self-abasement, the "pride that apes humility," is out of the range of his sympathies. Idleness, though it has the odour of sanctity, self-imposed suffering endured for no reason in particular, he abhors. He has no benediction for misery. His aim is to banish it from every heart, not to revel in it as a luxury if it has invaded his own. And so there is a cheerfulness running through all the ethical teaching of Judaism which is as far removed from the austerity of the cloister as it is from latter-day pessimism. It is brought to a focus in the Talmudic saying that the Spirit of God rests not on the idle or the woebegone, but on those who do their duty and are glad.⁶

The whole Bible is one great picture of activity. It has no place for monks or nuns; its men and women seek amid the struggles and trials of the world for the discipline that leads to moral perfection. Think only of that exquisite description of the virtuous woman at the end of Proverbs. The beauty of the portrait lies not in any abstract loveliness, but in its reasonableness, in its telling a tale that every heart, every common-sense mind, applauds. It is the portrait, not of a saint, but of what is equally noble and far more useful—a true woman. "She spreadeth out her hand to the poor"; "the law of kindness is on her tongue"; but "strength and dignity are her clothing," and "she looketh well to the ways of her household." She scorns to eat the "bread of idleness." And it is she that is deemed worthy to be called a "God-fearing woman"—one whose "works shall praise her in the gates."

¹ Exod. xxii. 23.

² *Ibid.*, xxiii. 3.

³ Deut. xvi. 20.

⁴ A warning against excess, even in ethics, is to be discerned in the striking Talmudic passage (Jer. Chagigah ii. 1): "The Law may be likened to two roads, one of fire, the other of snow. To follow the one is to perish by the fire; to follow the other is to die of the cold. The middle path alone is safe." Compare Aristotle's *Doctrine of the Mean*.

⁵ Maimonides cautions us against false pity. Compassion for the evildoer is cruelty to Society. (More Nebuchim, iii. 39.) ⁶ Sabbath, 30b.

"Seest thou a man diligent in his work? he shall stand before Kings."¹ The dignity of honest labour could not be more forcibly expressed. The wise man in Proverbs reserves his fiercest indignation, his most biting sarcasm, for the sluggard, with his plea for a little more slumber,² his excuses about the lion in the street.³ And the Talmud once more is the echo of Holy Writ. The Rabbins insist upon the glory of studying the Law, with almost wearisome iteration. And yet these very men were the most enthusiastic preachers of the Gospel of Work that the world has ever seen. "The study of the Law," they said, "that does not go hand-in-hand with active industry is doomed to failure."⁴ "Great is labour," they also taught, "for it honours the labourer."⁵ The saying recalls Mrs. Browning's admonition:

". Get work, get work,
Be sure 'tis better than what you work to get."⁶

"Flay a carcase in the streets," continues the Talmud, "and take thy wage, and say not I am a great man, and the occupation is beneath me."⁷ "Greater even than the God-fearing man is he who lives by his toil."⁸ "He who does not teach his son a handicraft-trade virtually teaches him to steal"⁹—the Talmud clearly anticipated the modern agitation in favour of technical teaching. The Rabbins preached, but practised too. In the schools they were the greatest of the great; in the world many of them followed the humblest callings. They were wood-cutters, shoemakers, masons, mere day-labourers—everything but idlers.¹⁰

Manliness—this is the dominant note of the Jewish ethic. "It is a good sign," the Rabbins characteristically remark, "when a man walks with head erect."¹¹ One is reminded of Longfellow's "Village Blacksmith," who "looks the whole world in the face." The same idea is discernible in the old Levitical law which warns us against hating our brother in our heart.¹² If we have a grievance against him we are to go to him in a straightforward way, and tell him so to his face. "Thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour."¹³ What a host of fatal misunderstandings would be prevented if this salutary command were generally obeyed!

But while so much emphasis is laid on a robust morality, it must not be supposed that the gentler virtues are overlooked. The crowning excellence of Moses, Israel's Lawgiver and greatest prophet, is his meekness.¹⁴ Similarly, Hillel—perhaps the most eminent of the Rabbins—is chiefly praised because of his patience and humility. Centuries before the Sermon on the Mount was preached, the Psalmist declared that "the meek shall

¹ Prov. xxii. 29.

² *Ibid.*, vi. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, xxvi. 13.

⁴ Aboth, ii. 2.

⁵ Nedarim, 49b.

⁶ "Aurora Leigh," Book iii.

⁷ Baba Bathra, 110a.

⁸ Berachot, 8a.

⁹ Kiddushin, 29a.

¹⁰ The passages in the Talmud relating to Work have been collected by Dr. Seligman Meyer: "Arbeit und Handwerk im Talmud," Berlin, 1878.

¹¹ Aboth d' R. Nathan. Cap. 37.

¹² Lev. xix. 17.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Num. xii. 3.

inherit the earth."¹ Be the oppressed, says the Talmud, rather than the oppressor.² He that is reviled, yet answers not, attains to a glory like that of the sun at the zenith.³ And so, too, with the virtue of forgiveness "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear a grudge,"⁴ is one of the oldest precepts of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Israelite is expressly warned against refusing to help his enemy in his hour of need—when, for example, he seeks his ass that has gone astray, or when his ox has fallen under its burden.⁵ "Rejoice not," cries the wise man, "when thy enemy falleth."⁶ "If," he adds elsewhere, "thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink."⁷ As for the Talmud—to give one typical instance—it tells⁸ how, stung by the incessant persecution of his neighbours, a famous Rabbi hurls an execration at his tormentors. His wife rebukes him. The Psalmist, she points out, prays not for the destruction of the sinner, but for the extinction of *sin*. "Let *iniquity*," it is written, "cease from the earth, and then the wicked will be no more."⁹

And this story serves also to illustrate the attitude of Judaism to Woman. The Talmudic sages who could imagine and describe a Rabbi being taught his duty by his wife, could not, in spite of some of their maxims on the subject being racy of the Eastern soil, and redolent of the spirit of the age, have had a low idea of female worth.¹⁰ Akiba, too, the master of a legion of disciples, the martyr for the cause of Judaism, owed his eminence and his fame to his wife.¹¹ She first inspired him with the enthusiasm which made him a teacher in Israel. She has her Biblical counterparts in a Miriam, a Deborah, a Huldah, an Esther—in the typical virtuous woman I spoke of just now. The Rabbins would not have understood the expression "single blessedness." "He who has no wife," they taught, "lives without happiness, without religion, without blessing."¹² In their opinion, clearly, marriage was *not* a failure; but then they were old-fashioned people who were not fortunate enough to live in the nineteenth century. "The unmarried man," they declared, "is not a complete man,"¹³ an idea which Shakespeare has expressed more fully:—

"He is the half-part of a blessed man,
Left to be finished by such as she;
And she a fair divided excellence,
Whose fulness of perfection lies in him."¹⁴

The utmost tenderness and consideration is enjoined on the husband. "The tears of the injured wife are counted in Heaven."¹⁵

I trust the sex will not think me uncomplimentary in passing direct from Woman to animals. There is a connecting link between the two in the

¹ Psalm xxxvii. 11.

² Lev. xix. 18.

³ *Ibid.*, xxv. 21.

⁴ The harsh sayings about the sex, which are occasionally to be found in the Talmud, are matched by the "fierce invectives" of the Church Fathers. See Lecky: "Hist. of European Morals," vol. ii. cap. 5.

⁵ Nedarim, 50a.

⁶ *King John*, Act ii., scene 1.

⁷ Sabbath, 88b.

⁸ Gen. xxlii. 4, 5.

⁹ Berachot, 10a.

¹⁰ Bereshith Rabbah, xvi.

¹¹ See Yebamoth, 62b.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Prov. xxiv. 17.

¹⁴ Psalm civ. 35.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

tendency of vile men to take advantage of their comparative defencelessness. The claims of the lower animals on human pity and consideration have been strangely overlooked by most ethical systems, not excluding Christianity. "In the range and circle of duties," remarks Mr. Lecky, "inculcated by the early Fathers, those to animals had no place. This is indeed," he continues, "the one form of humanity which appears more prominently in the Old Testament than in the New. The many beautiful traces of it in the former . . . gave way before an ardent philanthropy which regarded human interests as the one end, and the relations of man to his Creator as the one question, of life, and dismissed somewhat contemptuously as an idle sentimentalism, notions of duty to animals."¹ The only religious system, I believe, besides Judaism, which has given a prominent place to this duty, is that which is attributed to Zoroaster.² I need hardly cite the passages in the Hebrew Bible which insist upon a humane treatment of the brute. The precepts forbidding the muzzling of the ox when threshing,³ the slaughter of the dam and the young on the same day,⁴ and the taking of the mother-bird with the nestlings;⁵ the command which insists upon domesticated animals sharing with their master the rest of the Sabbath day;⁶ the saying in Proverbs that the righteous man regardeth the soul of his beast⁷—these are familiar to you all. The Rabbins enforced the duty with equal emphasis. Kindness to animals becomes, in the Talmud, the basis of a whole code of laws. The Rabbinical prescriptions regulating the mode of slaughtering animals intended for food are in part due to a desire to prevent the slightest unnecessary suffering.⁸ A great Rabbi is said to have been punished with long and continued physical pain because when a calf which was about to be killed ran to him bleating for protection, he roughly repulsed the animal, exclaiming, "Go; that is thy destiny."⁹ On the other hand, in a beautiful legend which the poet Coleridge has paraphrased, the Rabbins tell how Moses, while he is still Jethro's shepherd, seeks out a stray lamb and tenderly carries the tired creature in his arms back to the fold, and how a voice from Heaven cries, "Thou art worthy to be My people's pastor."¹⁰ This sympathy for the dumb animals is all the more remarkable because the Rabbins lived in an age when cruelty to both man and beast was commonly condoned. The terrible scenes in the Roman arena are only too clear an indication of the inhumanity which prevailed in the civilized world during the Talmudic period. It is true that philosophers like Plutarch condemned the cruelties of the amphitheatre, and even

¹ "Hist. of Europ. Morals," vol. ii. cap. 4.

² The reference is to the Vendidad.

³ Deut. xxv. 4.

⁴ Lev. xxii. 28.

⁵ Deut. xxi. 6.

⁶ Exod. xx. 10.

⁷ Prov. xii. 10.

⁸ The Israelite is enjoined to feed his animals before sitting down to his own meal. See Gittin, 62a.

⁹ Baba Metzia, 85a.

¹⁰ Shemoth Rabbah, Cap. II., where it is also declared that it was because he was a kind shepherd that David was divinely chosen King of Israel.

taught the positive duty of kindness to animals. But a doctrine tardily preached by a handful of theorists whom men generally agreed to ignore, was embodied in practical precepts and enforced by the Jewish Sages, inspired by the ancient law of the Bible. The gladiatorial shows they declared to be an abomination, they went even further, and forbade the chase.¹ Had they lived to-day, they might have founded the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; but they would not have sanctioned coursing or tolerated a fox-hunt.

This prohibition of cruelty to animals originates as much in the desire to prevent the moral debasement of the man as in the anxiety to save his possible victim from suffering. Judaism, indeed, is as strong in its subjective as in its objective morality. It condemns evil thoughts and evil desires, because of their degrading effects upon the mind and the soul, as severely as it stigmatises evil acts. "Give me thy heart, my son,"² is the constant cry of Jewish ethics. Full of significance is the warning against the mere feeling of covetousness which is embodied in the Decalogue side by side with the denunciations of the most deadly sins. A Lord Amberley³ could contemptuously question the utility of the warning; but a keener and a juster critic like Ewald clearly discerned its necessity.⁴ "Look," says Ruskin, too, "look into the history of any civilized nations; analyze the lives and thoughts of their nobles, priests, merchants, and men of luxurious life. Every other temptation is at last concentrated in this; pride, and lust, and envy, and anger, all give up their strength to avarice."⁵ In the same way the Israelite is cautioned against nourishing hatred, even though it be unaccompanied by any overt act.⁶ And the man who, according to the Psalmist, is worthy of standing in God's holy place, is he whose hands are clean but whose heart also is pure.⁷ "What the Almighty chiefly desires," says the Talmud in its turn, "is the heart."⁸ "As soon," it teaches elsewhere, "as the thought of sin has entered the mind, the guilt has already commenced."⁹ With evil desire, it further points out, a fierce battle must be fought until the victory is gained.¹⁰ And, finally, to quote one of those paradoxes in which the Rabbins delighted: "Sinful thoughts are worse than sin itself."¹¹ Nor is the rectitude to be aimed at simply negative; it is not to consist in the mere defeat of evil longings—in a moral vacuum. A positive striving after goodness and nobility of life is praised as the highest effort. In the ascending scale of virtue the Talmud places above the avoidance of sin and above humility that absolute purity of character which, it declares, alone merits to have the gift of the Holy Spirit.¹² Professor Sidgwick, then, is less fair or less acute than usual when he affirms, to the disparagement of Judaism, that

¹ Abodah Zarah, 18b.

² Prov. xxiii. 26.

³ "Analysis of Religious Belief," vol. ii. 246.

⁴ "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," vol. ii. p. 153.

⁵ Lev. xix. 17. See Siphrah on the passage.

⁶ Psalm xxiii. 3, 4.

⁷ Berachot, 5a.

⁸ Synhed., 106b.

⁹ Yoma, 29a.

¹⁰ "Ethics of the Dust," p. 15.

¹¹ Zech. vii. 10; viii. 17.

¹² Midrash on Num., v. 6.

¹³ Abodah Zarah, 20b.

"the contrast with the 'righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees' has always served to mark the requirements of 'inwardness' as a distinctive feature of the Christian code—an inwardness not merely negative, tending to the repression of vicious desires as well as vicious acts, but also involving a positive rectitude of the inner state of the soul."¹

One other characteristic of Jewish ethics remains to be noticed. The notion that Judaism teaches a narrow morality, to be practised for the exclusive benefit of the Jew, is as erroneous as the cognate idea that the God of the Hebrew Bible is a mere tribal God. It is impossible to explain away the stubborn fact that the old Mosaic Code contains the maxim, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; and that, as though to prevent any misunderstanding of the words, it almost immediately repeats the command in reference to the stranger.² Similarly, the poor man is to be liberally and considerably helped, even though he be a stranger or a sojourner; he is the Israelite's "brother."³ Even the Egyptian, Israel's original enemy, his taskmaster, his enslaver, is not to be oppressed.⁴ He is a stranger—isolated, helpless; and "ye know," adds the Law, "the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."⁵ The ancient wrong is to be forgotten; all that is to be remembered is the Egyptian's need, his possible suffering. But let us turn to the Rabbins. To rob a Gentile is declared to be even worse than robbing a Jew, for besides being immoral it disgraces Judaism.⁶ Nor is it only positive dishonesty, but deception, too, which is denounced, whoever its victim may be.⁷ The duty of kindness is made equally universal. We are bound, the Talmud teaches, to relieve the poor, to visit the sick, to bury the dead, without distinction of race or religion.⁸ When, according to the Rabbinical legend, the Egyptians were engulfed in the waters of the Red Sea, the angels desired to sing praises to God. The Almighty rebuked them. "My children, the work of My Hands, are perishing; this is not the time for psalmody."⁹ A Talmudic Rabbi was accustomed after his public devotions to offer up this prayer:—"May it be Thy will, O God, that no man may be my enemy, and that no enmity towards any man may take root in my heart." Similarly, a modern Jewish Catechism teaches that it is our duty to say every day when we rise, and before we lie down, and before we commence our prayers: "Behold I am about to obey the command, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Forgive, O Lord, him that injures me."¹⁰ As for the Rabbins of the Middle Ages, I might quote a long string of specific injunctions of the most precise and emphatic character, inculcating the practice of justice, honesty and charity towards all men, without distinction of creed.¹¹ I prefer, however, to cite

¹ "History of Ethics," p. 112.

² Lev. xix. 34.

³ Lev. xiv. 35, 36.

⁴ Deut. xxiii. 7.

⁵ Exod. xxiii. 9.

⁶ Tosefta B. Kama, cap. 10.

⁷ Chulin, 94a.

⁸ Gittin, 61a.

⁹ Mechilta on Exod. xv.

¹⁰ Johnson's "Mosaic Religion," translated by Isaac Leeser, p. 106.

¹¹ The whole question of the attitude of Judaism to the Gentile is ably discussed by Dr. Grunebaum: "Die Sittenlehre des Judenthums," Mannheim, 1867.

some maxims of these teachers on other subjects as well, because they will give you an idea of what Jewish ethical doctrine generally was at a time when morality was not the world's strong point, when, moreover, persecution was doing its best to crush out every noble aspiration from the Jewish soul.

The following is from a work of the eleventh century:¹ "Speak the truth; be modest; live on the coarsest fare rather than be dependent on others. Shun evil companions; be not like the flies which swarm in foul places. Rejoice not when thine enemy falls; be not both witness and judge; avoid anger, the heritage of fools." The following maxims are two centuries later:² "No crown surpasses humility, no monument a good name, no gain the performance of duty. The good man leads others in the right path, loves his neighbour, gives his charity in secret, does right from pure motives and for God's sake; he indulges in no idle talk, he is free from the lust of the eye; he is reviled yet answers not. He shuts his heart against all envy save that excited by another's virtues; he makes the righteous his example; he deceives no one by word or deed." A book³ belonging to nearly the same age contains these aphorisms: "Serve not thy Maker because thou hopest for Paradise, but from pure love of Him and His commands. Give thy life for His service, like a soldier in battle. Deceive no one, neither Jew nor Gentile; quarrel with no one, whatever his creed. If one would borrow of thee, and thou hast doubts of being repaid, do not lie, saying thou hast no money. On him that oppresses the poor or buys stolen goods, no blessing rests. If a murderer would take refuge with thee, consent not to hide him, yea, though he be a Jew. Honour the virtuous Gentile, not the irreligious Israelite. In morals Jew and Christian, as a rule, are alike. On those that clip the coin, on usurers, on such as have false weights and measures, or who are in any wise dishonest in business, there is no blessing. The worst failing is ingratitude; it must not be shown even to the brute. More guilty even than those who are cruel to animals are the employers that ill-treat their servants. Pay thy debts before thou givest alms. If one has cheated or injured thee in any way, let not revenge tempt thee to do the same to him." Here again are a few sayings chosen almost at random from various writers: "The alms given in health are gold; in illness, silver; left by will, copper." "Put no one to the blush in public; misuse thy power against no man." "Beware of drunkenness, and thou wilt not have to repent of shameful behaviour." "A man's virtues are pearls, and the thread on which they are strung is the fear of God; break the thread, and the pearls are lost one by one. Without morality there can be no real performance of religious duty."⁴

And thus we come back to our starting-point: Moral excellence is the essence of religion.

¹ "Orchot Chayim," by R. Elieser b. Isaac.

² "Rokeach," by R. Elasar, of Worms.

³ "Sepher Chassidim."

⁴ All the foregoing extracts are translated from Zunz: "Zur Geschichte und Literatur."

That Judaism should so persistently have taught this grand truth becomes all the more remarkable when it is remembered that the history of the Jew is an almost unbroken record of suffering. The world seems to have conspired to thrust him back by relentless persecution into the arms of formalism, to restrict the field for the play of his higher instincts to the external rites of religion. Shut out for many a weary century from intercourse with all men save the members of his own race, imprisoned in Ghettos, hunted down, hated, and reviled, it would have been no marvel if he had fixed his thoughts exclusively on the ceremonialism of the "Scribes and the Pharisees," if he had shown no feeling whatever for a lofty ethical ideal, nay, if he had nursed in his heart and practised in his life, sentiments of positive malevolence towards the world that so deeply wronged him. Well, indeed, might he have pleaded human nature as his justification. "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge?"¹

But Shylock is "the Jew that Shakespeare drew." He is not the Jew of real life, even in the Middle Ages, stained as their story is with the hot tears, nay, the very heart's blood, of the martyred race. The mediæval Jew did *not* take vengeance on his cruel foes. Nay, more than this, with a sublime magnanimity which rivals in grandeur, and far surpasses in duration, the noble patience ascribed to Jesus on the Cross, he could actually preach and practise the widest benevolence towards his oppressors. Throughout the Middle Ages, when Jews were daily plundered and tortured and done to death "for the glory of God," not a word was breathed against the morality of the victims. They suffered because they were heretics, because they would not juggle with their conscience, and profess a belief that did not live in their souls. The venerable Dr. Döllinger, a critic whose fairness is beyond cavil, has pointed this out.² But Jewish ethics soared to still nobler heights. The Jew preserved his integrity in spite of his suffering; but more than this, he forgave—ay, even blessed—its authors. The Jews hunted out of Spain in 1492, were in turn cruelly expelled from Portugal. Some took refuge on the African coast. Eighty years later the descendants of the men who had committed or allowed these enormities were defeated in Africa, whither they had been led by their king, Don Sebastian. Those who were not slain were offered as slaves at Fez to the descendants of the Jewish exiles from Portugal. "The humbled Portuguese nobles," the historian narrates, "were comforted when their purchasers proved to be Jews, for they knew that they had

¹ Shakespeare: *Merchant of Venice*, act iii., scene 1.

² "The Jews in Europe," an Address delivered before the Academy of Sciences in Munich, July, 1881.

humane hearts." ¹ It is in such incidents that the climax of Jewish morality is reached. If the lifelong anguish of Israel excites the most profound pity, only admiration can be yielded to that greatness of soul, which is the fairest gem in his crown of martyrdom.

¹ Graetz: "Geschichte der Juden," vol. viii. p. 379.

SPINOZA.

BY SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK.

SOME twelve years ago I was concerned in a movement for obtaining adherents in this country towards the erection of a monument to Benedict Spinoza at the Hague, where he spent the latter years of his life; and I received a good many interesting letters on that occasion from various persons. One of the shortest, and also one of the most interesting, was from a great man of letters whom this country has lately lost, Matthew Arnold. "After all," he said, "it seems rather absurd to treat Benedict Spinoza as an eminent Dutchman; the right thing to do would be to build him a statue and altar at the top of Pisgah, and to sacrifice on it seven bullocks like Louis Veuillot and seven rams like ——" I must not say to whom the seven rams were likened, for the name was that of a dignitary of the Church of England still living.

There is another modern testimony I should like to cite, as showing that Spinoza was by no means merely an eminent systematic philosopher. It is the testimony of Flaubert, one of the greatest of recent French writers. Flaubert, writing in 1872 to Georges Sand, tells her what he had been doing lately, and he says, amongst other things:

"I shall get back to work on my "St. Anthony" in a week's time, when I have done with Kant and Hegel, two great men who make me feel stupid. When I take leave of them I fall to, like one famished, on my old Spinoza, who is worth them all. What genius! What a piece of work is his *Ethics*!"

This is useful for two purposes: to show that Flaubert was not merely a frivolous French novelist; and that in modern France the best people do not find Spinoza by any means obsolete.

It would be altogether out of place to enter here at length on the facts of Spinoza's life, but it may be well to remind you shortly of what was his origin, and where and how he lived. Spinoza belonged to a family of Spanish¹ Jews, one of the many families driven into exile by the revival of persecution against the Jews which took place in the Spanish Peninsula towards the end of the sixteenth century. It is a matter of general history how the Spaniards, having attained a very great place in the world, set themselves systematically to lose it by driving out of the country nearly all the best elements within it. Not content with having

¹ See Dr. Martineau's *Study of Spinoza*, chap. i.

reconquered the part of Spain which had been occupied by the Arabs, they expelled first the Arabs and then the Jews, and having reduced Spain to an admirable standard of orthodoxy, they proceeded to make Spain what she is now, a third-rate power, with no literature to speak of, and with absolutely no influence on European thought. So Spain ultimately had her reward. The immediate effect was that a considerable number of Spanish and Portuguese Jews migrated to the Netherlands—at that time the only country in Europe where free thought could be said really to exist, or where a colony of Jews could hope to settle with tolerable freedom from disturbance. Even there it was an experiment. However, the experiment succeeded. The Israelite colony soon attracted more settlers when it was found that they were sure of an asylum. They became prosperous, and you may see amongst the Rembrandts in the National Gallery his admirable portraits of some of the great Jewish merchants of his own time. In one of these Jewish families of Amsterdam Spinoza was born in the winter of 1632. At a very early age he became learned in the law of his people, and in the theology of the Rabbis, and showed symptoms of beginning to think for himself. The stories that are told of this part of his life are very fragmentary, and not altogether consistent, and we are left a great deal to conjecture as to what really took place. Something he certainly did, perhaps in the way of trying to form a circle of young men like-minded with himself, which caused the authorities of the synagogue to treat him as a dangerous person. It was not merely a matter of speculative orthodoxy; the Jewish synagogue existed wholly on sufferance in Amsterdam. The leaders of the synagogue evidently thought that they were tolerated only on condition of being as orthodox as it was possible for Jews to be, and that if any sort of heterodoxy were suffered amongst them they might lose the sufferance on which they had so far counted. As men of business, they may well have thought rightly enough. The result was that Spinoza received strong hints to keep his opinions to himself. It seems he even received offers of substantial reward on those terms. But he was found inflexible, and at length was solemnly excommunicated. This was in 1650, when he was not quite twenty-four years of age.

He took the excommunication as a natural and inevitable consequence of his resolution, and having been in this way shut out from obtaining, as he easily might have done, a position of prosperity and honour among his own people, he took himself to making a living by grinding glasses for optical instruments. His work, it appears, was of special excellence. In the year 1670 he removed to the Hague, where he completed his principal works; his greatest work, the *Ethics*, was in hand, as we know from his letters, during the greater part of his active life, but was printed only after his death.

In 1663 he had a tempting offer of the Chair of Philosophy at Heidelberg, and the conditions were such as appeared to give him great liberty

to say whatever he pleased ; but there was a saving clause to the effect of not teaching anything contrary to the established religion, and Spinoza, although he was a poor man, preferred philosophizing in his own way to holding a chair of philosophy even under the most honourable conditions with any such obligation attached to it. Therefore he declined the Elector's offer in a very courteous letter, but with unmistakable decision.

He was not only a poor man, but a weakly man ; he was of consumptive habit, and died at the age, which may be called early for a philosopher, of forty-four, in the year 1677. The event excited very little notice at the time, but his posthumous works, published shortly afterwards, raised a storm of controversy which gave the first indication of his coming renown.

Spinoza had, to some extent, special relations with this country through his friend Oldenburg, a learned German who migrated to England, and was the first Secretary to the Royal Society. Many of Spinoza's most interesting letters were written to Oldenburg, and the originals of some of them are preserved in the Royal Society's library. But there is no evidence that English philosophers had any notion of Spinoza's importance either in his lifetime or for a considerable time afterwards.

I have mentioned that Spinoza was cast out of the synagogue with all solemn forms, and it is well known that he never joined any other religious body. He was outside all forms of religious bodies existing in the Netherlands, and although he made no attempt to dissuade any one from a belief which satisfied him, he certainly had no attachment of his own to any recognised creed. It seems, therefore, a curious thing that a perfectly solitary and independent philosopher, living as Spinoza did, should count among the people who have had a decided influence on the religion of modern Europe ; yet such is the fact, and it is a fact that sets one thinking in many ways. Such a thing could not have happened in the case of any Asiatic religion. For example, one cannot imagine a Mahometan, or a Buddhist, being seriously influenced by a holy man who did not belong to his own religion, or to any other religion in particular, and who wholly declined to be bound by Mahometan or Buddhist formulas. Still less can we imagine Spinoza's own people admitting anything of the kind to be possible among them. I think it is only in Christendom—and in Western Christendom—that such a thing could be even fairly probable.

Let us consider for a moment what this means. It means that Christianity, at all events Western Christianity, differs from the other great religions in the world in having a certain expansive and elastic quality. By this quality it is constantly taking up new elements into itself, and is not transforming, yet seriously modifying in effect, its earlier dogmas and the practical conclusions drawn from them. Now Christianity comes to have this expansive quality, which I think it nearly has, is a very curious historical question. A still more curious question, perhaps, is how Christianity did become the religion of imperial Rome at all ; how it made its

great leap in the hands of St. Paul from the Eastern to the Western world. When Christianity had once begun to take up the elements of Greek thought, then it becomes less surprising that the expansive and elastic quality of the old Greek philosophy should have continued to manifest itself under the new form. When we think of the history of the early Church, we are sometimes apt to forget how many things it saved. It may not have saved them in the exact fashion in which we should have liked to have them, but in what we call the dark ages the question was whether the remembrance of Greek and Roman civilization should be saved at all. Some thinkers have held that Christianity was an agent in destroying the Roman empire, but it seems to me to have been rather the other way. The Roman empire was effete, and was already in a course of breaking up; and the Church of Rome, being the strongest thing that was left in the world, took to itself such fragments of the ancient Roman civilization and of the ancient Greek thought as it could assimilate consistently with its own fundamental ideas. It is, perhaps, too little to say *fragments* of Roman civilization, for the order and discipline of the Roman Church have preserved to this day a great deal of the old order of the Roman Empire. Hobbes's epigram on the papacy, itself imperial among epigrams, contains much of the truth of the matter. It is "the ghost of the Roman Empire, sitting crowned on the grave thereof."

We also have to remember that Rome had taken up (more or less imperfectly, but still it had taken up) the enlightening influences of Greek thought. And the expansiveness of modern Western Christianity is perhaps due to the Greek spirit which was first absorbed by Roman civilization and institutions, and then taken up into the framework of the Church amid the general ruin wrought by the barbarian conquests. This process, I need hardly say, has gone much farther than most official expounders of Christian doctrine are at liberty to admit. As my friend and master, Sir Henry Maine, once said: "Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world that is not Greek in its origin," and to this Greek origin, I think, we may fairly refer the vitality of Western Christianity, which has prevented it from standing still, and has enabled it to take up such new influences as that of Spinoza.

We have to consider then in what way Spinoza can be said to have influenced modern religious ideas. In the first place we have the example of his life, which was almost a singular one among modern philosophers. Secondly, we have the actual contribution made by Spinoza to the dogmatic and historical criticism of the documents on which the Christian religion is externally based. Lastly (and this is, after all, much the most important), we have the general spirit and temper of Spinoza's philosophy as to the relations of man to the universe he lives in.

In the first place, as Spinoza's life, it was one of the most blameless lives ever led by a philosopher. That alone does not prove his philosophy to be true; we can hardly say that it even tends to prove its truth. It

tends only to prove the sincerity with which the man's beliefs, whether more or less right in themselves, were formed and held. But the practical effect of such a character as Spinoza's is very great. It has secured a fair hearing for his philosophy in quarters where otherwise there would have been, and indeed there was, much prejudice against it. Spinoza's philosophy, and the form in which he put it, were altogether distasteful to everything orthodox. Even when Spinoza meant to be conciliatory, there was something about his uncompromising way of stating his results which gave peculiar offence to orthodox theologians of all sects and denominations. But Spinoza's life was such that even his enemies could find nothing to say against it; for we need not count a few idle tales which were in circulation only for a short time, and are now deservedly forgotten except by minute investigators of Spinoza's biography.

The principal authority for Spinoza's life is a little book written by a Lutheran minister at the Hague,—a good man, who from his soul detested Spinoza's doctrines, but who also was a kindly and veracious sort of man, and who took some trouble to ascertain the facts as they really were. He evidently took great interest in Spinoza's character, notwithstanding the wicked and abominable nature of his writings, and was at some pains to refute the calumnies which were being spread about Spinoza some few years after his death. Now he tells us about Spinoza's life that it was of the most quiet and peaceable kind. He was of a very even temper; nobody ever saw him either very sad or very merry. (One could hardly expect high animal spirits of a man in Spinoza's state of health.) He was always courteous and civil, considerate to the people of the house especially when any of them were ill. He used to talk to the children of the house, and told them to mind what their elders said, and not to fail to go to church. When they came back from the congregation, he would ask them what they had heard from the preacher. "In particular," this good minister, Colerus, "my predecessor, Dr. C. —, of my memory, being a really learned man, was much honoured by Spinoza. Indeed, he sometimes went to hear him himself, praised his exposition of Scripture, and the appropriate applications; and the landlord and his fellow-lodgers by no means missed him. Once he was asked by the landlady whether, in his opinion, Spinoza could be saved by her religion." It was a curious thing for a minister to ask an excommunicated Jew, but it shows the sort of impression that Spinoza had made on those he lived with. He answered her thus: "Your religion is very well; you have no need to quarrel for your salvation so long as you hold yourself to a good life." Spinoza was much too sensible a man to intrude on the content in their own way of life; I do not think he was with the sort of people who not only must have but always tinkering them. In short the good Lutheran minister

is a constant panegyric of Spinoza's character, intermixed with violent denunciations of his writings, and praises of the many worthy persons who refuted them. Those worthy persons are not much read at this day. I have tried to read some of them, but I cannot say I have thoroughly succeeded.

So much as to Spinoza's life. In recent times I think no one of any account has spoken of Spinoza's personal character save with respect and even reverence. I may instance amongst others Heine, the greatest Hebrew since Spinoza, one of the greatest of modern writers, and also one of the least reverent. But Heine, when he came to speak of Spinoza, said his life was only to be compared to that of his great predecessor, Jesus Christ.

Now we come to Spinoza's contributions to the criticism of Scripture. The work in which these are contained is the *Theologico-Political Treatise*. I will give you the title of it from an old English translation which was published as early as 1689. It is called "A Treatise partly theological and partly political, containing some few discourses to prove that the Liberty of Philosophizing (that is, making use of Natural Reason) may be allowed without any prejudice to piety, or to the peace of any Commonwealth, and that the loss of public peace and religion itself must necessarily follow where such a liberty of reasoning is taken away." It was already much to publish such a title-page in the year 1670, in a community that professed to hold the orthodox principles of Calvinism. Further, this *Theologico-Political Treatise* has two striking characters. It was the first, or almost the first, comprehensive plea for toleration published in modern Europe. In that respect, no doubt, it only took up the work of those whom we call Humanists,—the great scholars of the sixteenth century, who spread abroad the study of Greek, and the intelligent love of antiquity in general, and whose work was sadly interrupted by the Reformation. We may all think what we please about the Reformation; for my own part I am apt to think that the way in which it proceeded was a misfortune for European civilization. At all events the Reformation was occupied with religious wars and dissensions, and the genial learning of a Humanist like Erasmus could have no place for a time. To a certain extent Spinoza may be said, in his *Political Treatise*, to take up the burden of Erasmus and his successors. In the second place, this book was the great forerunner of modern biblical criticism. For the first time the learned world had forced upon itself a writer who professed to take Scripture as its own witness, and whose sole witness of Scripture alone showed that, if construed to bear the sense required by the ordinary advocates of biblical authority, it sets out to argue with the orthodox upholders of the biblical premises. He does not criticise the Scriptures on historical grounds. He says, in effect: "I will not dispute the historical grounds; I take the Scriptures, and show

from the Scriptures themselves that your way of interpreting them is absurd, and that your conclusion about the duty of believing the letter of the Scripture are absolutely inconsistent with Scripture itself." But in the course of doing that, Spinoza was led to the most remarkable anticipations of a great deal of what we now call modern criticism. For example, Spinoza points out (as indeed certain learned Jews had earlier pointed out, but with designed obscurity), that we cannot imagine Moses sitting down to write the account of his own death which is contained in the so-called Books of Moses; and, in like manner, that a man who wrote "the Canaanite was then in the land," must have been writing at a time long after the Jews had occupied Canaan. This, and other such matters, are now regarded as the elements of intelligent criticism of the Scripture narrative, but two hundred years ago they were exceedingly bold things for anybody to print and publish. Probably it was for such opinions as these that Spinoza was put out of the synagogue. As regards the influence of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* in this country in particular, it was translated as early as 1689. Some years earlier the chapter about miracles was taken out of the book and printed by itself, but without any acknowledgment of its authorship, and in a sort of fragmentary way. And at various times in the eighteenth century Freethinkers and Deists drew a great deal on the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* for arguments against the more orthodox divines.

To sum up the main points of this treatise: it gives us, for one thing, the rational treatment of what is called the inspiration of Scripture. As Spinoza points out in a sufficiently clear and uncompromising way, we must read the Bible as a book written by men, who were writing for men, and who were not free from prejudices of their readers. Then there is the chapter on miracles, which I have just mentioned, where Spinoza demolishes the vulgar idea of miracles as conclusively as Hume did, in his mind, and I think in a larger spirit and with more permanent effect. Spinoza points out that—

"the vulgar notion is that God's power and providence do manifestly appear when they see anything strange and unusual happen, contrary to the customary notions they have of Nature, especially that which happens is for their benefit and advantage. So they conclude that those men deny the being and providence of God, who endeavour to explain and understand what they call natural causes. They, indeed, think that while Nature follows its wonted course God doth nothing, and on the contrary, that the power of Nature and natural causes are idle and that they imagine the power of God and the power of Nature to be distinct and almost opposite things, neither do they think of God at any time so wonderful as when, according to their notions, he subdues the power of Nature."

He then proceeds to show, on the contrary, that nothing can really happen contrary to Nature, and to explain his own position, that we cannot know the existence, nor consequently the providence of God, by miracles, but they more manifestly appear in the constant and unchangeable order of Nature. He goes on to show in detail how the passages of Scripture relied on for the current view of miracles are more intelligible when explained as examples of common Oriental rhetoric, or in other non-miraculous ways. In most of these cases Spinoza is perfectly right; in some few he draws inferences which modern scholarship would hardly recognise. You must remember that he sets out with admitting the authority of Scripture in some sense, so that he is sometimes driven to forced interpretations. I will quote the summing up of his position:

"When the Scripture saith, that for the sins of men the earth is barren, or that blind men are recovered to sight by faith, it signifies no more than do those other sayings, that God is angry, or grieved with our sins, that He repents of the good He hath done, or intended, and that God by seeing a sign called to mind His promise: all which expressions are spoken poetically, or according to the opinion and prejudice of the writer. So that we absolutely conclude that all things which Scripture relates to have happened, did happen, as all things do, according to the laws of Nature; and if in Scripture there be anything recorded which by plain and evident demonstration can be proved to be repugnant to the laws of Nature, or impossible to follow from them, we ought to believe it was inserted by sacrilegious men, for whatever is against Nature is against Reason, and whatever is against Reason ought to be rejected as absurd."

Spinoza holds, in short, that God's works are not something contrary to Nature, but are the order of Nature itself.

Another point considered in the *Theologico-Political Treatise* is the of the fundamental and practical portion of religion, as a guide to the conduct of life, to matters of speculative opinion. Here, again, Spinoza is very plain-spoken. He says that the root of the matter is not speculative opinions, but in obedience to the moral law. There are two chapters in his book, the 13th and 14th, in which Spinoza's position as to the relation of faith to philosophy is worked out. Spinoza's point is that practical religion calls it—that is, the essentials of practical religion—is a religion that and does not require any particular speculative opinions. He says that "it follows, even from the words of Scripture, that those who persecute the opinions of just men who differ from theirs, and do not maintain their doctrines. They that are thereby only found to be believers, and whose religion is anti-Christ. Lastly, it follows that faith is that which is in themselves true, but such only as is obedient to obedience." Spinoza does not mean

that it is absolutely indifferent to a man's salvation what he thinks, but only that it does not concern the civil power what his opinions are, so long as they are not opinions which manifestly lead to a dangerous or immoral life. And then he goes on to enumerate those doctrines of universal faith, as he calls them, which are the most that can be reasonably regarded as necessary in a well-ordered commonwealth, viz. :

"That there is a God, or Supreme Being, who is most just and merciful, by whose example every man ought to regulate his life; secondly, that this God is One, which opinion is absolutely necessary to make a man adore, admire, and love God—for devotion, admiration, and love, are caused by that excellency which is in one above all others; thirdly, that He is everywhere present, or that all things are known to Him, for if anything were hidden from Him, or if men did not think that He seeth all things, we might doubt of His equity and justice, whereby He governeth all things; fourthly, that He hath supreme power and dominion over all things, that He doth nothing by compulsion, but of His own goodwill and pleasure; fifthly, that the worship of God, and obedience to Him, consists only in justice and charity towards our neighbours; sixthly, that only they who obey God by such a course of life will be saved; and others, who are slaves to their lusts and pleasures, will be condemned; lastly, that God pardoneth the sins of those that repent, because there is no man living without sin; therefore, if this were not an article of faith, all would despair of salvation."

You must not suppose that these positions are statements of Spinoza's own philosophy, at any rate in his own way; they are such as indeed Spinoza might adopt, but after an explanation of the terms which would bring out a result very different from any form of popular religion. Spinoza is considering the precepts of religion from the practical point of view of the statesman, as guarantees of civil order. In the last chapter of the treatise he points out, rising almost to eloquence, although written in an artificial language, that the liberty of honest opinion is not a danger to the commonwealth, but is rather a safeguard. One passage which is quoted evidently had reference to the religious wars which had been going on :

"Can anything be more pernicious than to treat per-
ingenuous disposition as enemies, and for no crime or
them to death, making the scaffold, which frights not
public theatre, whereon such innocent persons give
courage and patience, as turn to the shame and reproach
magistrate's majesty?"

Again :—

"Schisms proceed not from the study of truth."

ness and moderation, but from an imperious humour of prescribing to others; and therefore they are rather to be accounted schismatics who damn other men's writings, and stir up the waspish multitude against them, than those that write to learned men, and call nothing but reason to their aid; for they are truly disturbers of public peace who in a free commonwealth would take away the liberty of men's judgment, which ought not to be suppressed."

And he sums up by saying that a Commonwealth's greatest safety is to place religion and piety in the practice of justice and charity, and to make things sacred as much subject to the Supreme Power as things civil, and to take cognizance of nothing but men's actions, suffering every man to think what he will, and speak what he thinks.

The treatise had no apparent practical effect at the time, but it was largely read. It appeared in various issues with false title-pages and other precautions against the printers being prosecuted, and within a short time it was also circulated in translations.

I have already mentioned that during the eighteenth century it was a sort of arsenal for Freethinkers, although the value of the principal part of Spinoza's philosophy was certainly not recognized by those who thus used it.

But we must come to the real centre of Spinoza's philosophy to find that which, after all, has given vitality to his work. A man does not live as a great philosopher merely by happy anticipations of modern historical criticism, nor even by showing a more enlightened view of the relation of Church and State than was common in his time. When Spinoza deals with philosophy for its own sake, he distinguishes the precepts which are useful for the outward conduct of life, from the inner wisdom by which man attains happiness for himself. A man may be a very good citizen without being at all happy, or at peace in his own mind. Still more may a good citizen without being a philosopher, or even without having any serious thought to the ultimate problems of the world. Now he points out emphatically that spiritual happiness does not consist in any rules whatever, even the best of rules; not that rules are unnecessary, but happiness will not come by obedience alone. Yes, I think, with the great moralist of all persuasions. As many philosophers have done, and as the founders of the religions have done, from the futility of the common objects of man and desire. These may be satisfied, but after they are satisfied gives himself time to think, he finds, as the Preacher says, that all is vanity. Deliverance from vanity is the object of man as much as it had been the object of the great philosophers. Spinoza's way, however, is absolutely opposed to this. It is still nominally supreme, I suppose, over all other ways. Kings who have attained the stage of thinking

seriously at all. The Eastern way is to say that not only the common objects of desire, regarded as an end in themselves, are vanity, but that all finite life is vanity; the world is a bad thing; life is a bad thing; let us escape from it altogether and be delivered. Such is the avowed object of the great Asiatic religions, with the one exception of the religion of the Jews. The Jewish point of view, which is, of course, what Spinoza had to work upon, is, on the contrary, that life is good; life is a gift of God and to be enjoyed, and it is to be made the most of. But the philosophy of orthodox Judaism, such as it was down to Spinoza's day, had very little foundation to build upon. The common belief that virtue was always rewarded in this world, and vice always punished, was evidently insufficient. Its insufficiency had been seen by the prophets and by the nameless poet of the Book of Job. A new base had to be found. I shall not attempt here to explain Spinoza's philosophy, having already made, in a published work, such contribution as I could to that very difficult undertaking. The central idea, however, is the union of man with the order of the world. In so far as a man can understand that he is part of the order of the world, and can consciously realize this with cheerful acquiescence, he has the wisdom which delivers him from vanity and earthly desires and the vicissitudes of life. This is a hard thing to accept at first sight, and Spinoza does not pretend that it is easy. "You tell me"—so one may abridge the gist of several of his remarks—"this way is hard; certainly it is so. If it were not hard, everybody would attain to it; all things worth having are hard." Spinoza's view involves a great demolition of prejudice. It involves particularly the demolition of the great prejudice that the world and all that therein is was made for man and exists for his benefit; in short, of the whole doctrine of so-called Final Causes.

The Appendix to the first part of Spinoza's *Ethics* contains his opinion of the current doctrine. He says that men being accustomed to various instruments for their own use, and finding that many parts of Nature which they did not make are useful to them, conclude that they must be so because these natural conveniences were made for them by somebody else. From the example of the instruments accustomed to provide for themselves, they conclude that there is one or more rulers of Nature, having a free will like man, who have provided all these things for them and made them for their use. They proceed to consider what the designs and temper of these rulers are like, and they set about propitiating the gods, so that they may be better than their neighbours. But then they find that these are not convenient, but the reverse; earthquakes, pestilences, and the like, and these they account for by supposing that the gods are for some wrong that men have done them; or for some neglect of observance of their worship; and although experience shows every day that good and ill happen to the just and the

not cease from the ingrained prejudice; for it was easier to relegate *this* among the many other things they did not know, and so to keep their present and inborn condition of ignorance, than to destroy all that fantastic building they had made, and set about thinking out a new one.[¶] Wherefore they made sure that the judgments of the gods were altogether above the capacity of man. This, Spinoza says in a singularly caustic passage, would have been enough to prevent all true philosophy from ever being discovered, if it had not been for the mathematics, which showed the way to a clear and intelligible manner of thinking.

I need not tell you that Spinoza does not clear up the world-old problem of the origin of the evil. Still, he has his own way of looking at it. He says that people are accustomed to argue thus:—If everything is a consequence of the absolutely perfect nature of God, why are there so many imperfect things in Nature? But the perfection of things is to be measured only by their own nature and power, and things are not more or less perfect because they are agreeable or the reverse to the senses of mankind; or because they are helpful to our nature or repugnant to it. "As for those who ask why God did not make all men in such sort that they should be led solely by the command of reason, I have no other answer than that it was because matter was not wanting for Him to create everything from the greatest degree of perfection even to the least." That is not a pleasant answer to human pride, but I think it is a great deal nearer the truth than any of the popular ones, and not the less so because it is specially obnoxious to the ordinary assumption of orthodox theologians. Many theologians have deserved the respect, some have deserved the reverence and love, of all good men. But there is also a kind of professional theology which may be described as a pretended science of teaching God Almighty his own business. Accordingly Spinoza, having insisted that God Almighty knew his own business best, was denounced as blasphemer of the most wicked and insidious kind, and the *Ethics* forth a storm of condemnation almost greater than had been excited by the *Theologico-Political Treatise*.

Spinoza's method of arriving at the union of man with the order of things with God—(for in Spinoza these expressions are either synonymous or distinguished only by refined metaphysical differences)—is by a gradual process. In this he is like the old Greek philosophers of whom Spinoza's dialectic are very like the reasoning of the Stoics. I do not mean his earliest followers, but those who carried out his doctrine in the Arabic schools.

A curious point of contact between Spinoza and the better sort of Christianity. Spinoza's results are arrived at in a purely rational way. They are essentially like the views which one finds in the writings of the philosophers who are commonly called Mystics. There is no intention of founding a school, and did

not even wish his work to pass by his name. He was more successful than Spinoza, for we do not really know at all who he was. His book is known as the *German Theology*, and I think it is about as certain as anything in the history of letters can be that Spinoza had never read or heard of it; and if he had read or heard of it, he probably would have paid no attention to it. But it is important to see how very far this fourteenth-century German, who, for anything one knows may have been a monk, was removed from the vulgar machinery of practical theology. He says that a man who has attained a real sense of religion loves the good only for its own sake. These men, he says, are in a state of freedom, because they have lost the fear of pain or hell, and the hope of reward or heaven, and are living in pure submission to eternal goodness, in the perfect freedom of fervent love. This mind was in Christ in perfection, and is also in His followers—in some more, in some less. And again he says: "Mark: that when true love and true light are in a man, good is known and loved for itself, and as itself." And he says again: "In this sense the saying is true that God loveth not Himself; that if there were aught better than God, God would love it, and not Himself." And much more, which is well worth seeing at large in the book. These passages and several others might almost have come out of the last part of the *Ethics* of Spinoza. So far as I know there is absolutely no trace of historical connection, but it is important to see that a fourteenth-century Catholic, living in a time when the doctrines of the Church of Rome would not generally lend themselves to such views, could write down this, and apparently without any consciousness that he was in any way offending against orthodoxy. I do not mean you to suppose that the author of this book would have been what we call a reformer, but I think he would probably have told you that what the Church commanded was no doubt right, but that all these ceremonies and details of dogma were as nothing compared to a man having the true light.

Spinoza's work fell, at the time, quite flat, not only on the orthodox but on most of the unorthodox, until towards the end of the eighteenth century. It was a time when people cared very little for anything, could not put into definite propositions, and all through the eighteenth century you will find that the higher side of Spinoza's teaching was absolutely ignored. I think there is not a single writer in the eighteenth century who can be said to grapple with Spinoza seriously. His opponents picked logical holes in one or more of his propositions, but it was not a very difficult feat, although I am bound to say that it was done ill rather than well. Freethinkers, on the other hand, picked out its *Theologico-Political Treatise*, and picked out its arguments against miracles and so forth, as controversial weapons; whereas it is not whether a man believes in miracles or not, but in what spirit he believes or disbelieves them. The

know, in modern Europe who really took hold of Spinoza in the right way was Lessing, the great restorer of literature and criticism in Germany. Then the spirit of Spinoza, which was first awakened in Lessing, took hold of Goethe. To say that it took hold of Goethe is to say that it was established in the centre of the European movement of letters and civilization. I need hardly tell those of you whom it interests to know it that the spirit of Spinoza has been actively at work ever since in the whole development of modern German philosophy.

His influence then came to England through Coleridge, who was a man of genius in many directions: in poetry, in religion, and almost, although not quite, in philosophy. Coleridge learned to know Spinoza from the Germans, and taught much of what he knew to Wordsworth. There is an odd story in Coleridge's autobiography, of how he roamed about with Wordsworth on the Quantocks, where he was living during the early period of the great French war. There was an alarm about Jacobins and corresponding societies, and so a disguised police officer was sent to watch the movements of Coleridge and Wordsworth as being more or less suspected persons. Coleridge heard afterwards what this man had reported of the fragments of conversation he had picked up. "At first he fancied that we were aware of our danger, for he often heard me talk of "Spy Nozy"; which he was inclined to interpret of himself and of a remarkable feature belonging to him; but he was speedily convinced that it was the name of a man who had made a book and lived long ago." Coleridge was accordingly left unmolested. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to suppose that something of Coleridge's talk about Spinoza found its way into Wordsworth's poetry, and from thence into what, for want of a better word, we call Nature-Worship—an element which has certainly been an influence for the better in nearly all English literature since.

But there were also theologians and philosophers who learnt much from Coleridge in due time, and amongst others one whose name I can never mention otherwise than with reverence—and I think it would have been the same even if I had not had the privilege of knowing him—I mean the late Mr. Maurice, one of the most enlightened and large-hearted men the Church of England ever had. He wrote a book on Modern Philosophy in which he gave many pages to Spinoza, and treated him as you expect a man of his nature to do (although evidently dissenting conclusions), with the utmost respect and moral sympathy. I think we must have taught a great many people to think better of the popular theology does; and what Maurice's influence on English theology I need not say here. So that I think one can say that Spinoza has been a living power not only in modern philosophy, but in the best life of modern English theology. I think there are still sections in the Church of England, and in other Churches in England, which refuse to have anything to do with modern criticism, and regard men like Maurice and

Kingsley as dangerous. From their own point of view those sections are doubtless right, and they have their reward.

I am not here (need I say it?) to endeavour to persuade you that everything Spinoza said is right; or that you may not find serious logical defects in his work. That is one of the great misapprehensions that have grown up about Spinoza; because he put some of his work into the form of demonstration in the manner of his time, it is supposed to be an absolutely logical system which must all stand or fall together. That is an entire mistake. And it would be a mistake even if Spinoza had thought that he had made an absolutely logical demonstration. The living power of a philosopher does not depend on his finding the whole truth, a thing which certainly no man has yet found. But Spinoza did that on a great scale which all of us on some scale, be it small or great, can certainly do. He sought truth with an open heart; he never feared to face it, however unexpected its appearance might be; and he never turned back from the consequences of that of which he was once fully persuaded. He is, perhaps, the great example in modern Europe of one who worked as the true philosopher should work. He built (to borrow the words used by Mr. Browning for a different purpose in one of his noblest poems) "broad on the roots of things."

I have not thought it necessary so far to give out a text for this discourse, but I propose now to give you a text for the end. It is from William Blake, who, with the possible exception of Coleridge, is, in my judgment, the man of the greatest religious genius whom we have had in England in recent generations. I need hardly tell you that William Blake was also a madman, a dangerous heretic in both letters and art, and altogether unaccounted for by orthodox canons of poetry and painting. In other words, he was a great and original artist, endowed, moreover, with that peculiar kind of philosophical temper which we call religious insight as distinguished from pure intellectual speculation. Blake did not care much, I suppose, about the literal acceptance of his own words, and if any one construes them literally it is entirely on his own responsibility. But I think that in the words of Blake there is a good deal of the sense of Spinoza, notwithstanding that Blake probably never heard of him.

"The worship of God is honouring his gifts in other men, each according to his genius, and loving the greatest men best. Those who praise or calumniate great men hate God, for there is no other God."

THE RELIGION OF NATURE, AS TAUGHT BY JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU.

BY MRS. FREDERIKA MACDONALD.

"J'APERÇOIS Dieu partout dans ses œuvres, je le sens en moi, je le vois tout autour de moi : mais sitôt que je veux chercher où il est, ce qu'il est, quelle est sa substance, sitôt que je veux le contempler en lui-même, il m'échappe, et mon esprit troublé n'aperçoit plus rien."

"Pénétré de mon insuffisance, je ne raisonnerai jamais sur la nature de Dieu ; car ce qu'il y a de plus injurieux à la divinité n'est pas de n'y point penser, mais d'en mal penser."

"Il est au fond des âmes un principe inné de justice et de vertu sur lequel, malgré nos propres maximes, nous jugeons nos actions, et celles d'autrui, et c'est à ce principe que je donne le nom de Conscience."

"La Conscience ne trompe jamais ; elle est le vrai guide de l'homme ; elle est à l'âme ce que l'instinct est au corps ; qui la suit, obéit à la nature."—*Vicaire Savoyard* *Emile*, liv. iv.

"Je veux chercher si dans l'ordre civil il peut y avoir quelque règle d'administration légitime et sure, en prenant les hommes tels qu'ils sont, et les lois telles qu'elles peuvent être . . ."

"La force est une puissance physique : je ne vois point quelle moralité peut résulter de ses effets. S'il faut obéir par force, on n'a pas besoin d'obéir par devoir : et si l'on n'est plus forcé d'obéir, on n'y est plus obligé. . . ."

"Le plus fort n'est jamais assez fort pour être toujours le maître s'il ne transforme sa force en droit, et l'obéissance en devoir."—*Contrat Social*, chap. iii.

IN 1760, that is to say, a short time before the publication of Rousseau's great works, the *Emile* and *The Social Contract*, a satirical play,¹ was put on the French stage by one Palissot, a *protégé* of the Jesuits, whose purpose it was to ridicule the leading philosophers, and their social doctrines. In this play, Jean Jacques, then known to fame only as the author of a popular romance and of two remarkable essays attacking the corrupt civilization of his day, was represented walking upon all fours, and zig-zagging, Nebuchadnezzar-like, in a meadow.

How does this caricature show us, in an exaggerated light, of course, the character and direction of the "Religion of Nature" taught by Rousseau? If we are to be guided by popular modern theories, it actually shows us that in other words, the prophetic message that produced so deep an impression upon men and women, who were certainly, to say the least, not in their generation as we are in ours, was nothing better

¹ See the comedy was composed to please the Princesse de Robespierre, the Duke of Luxembourg, and mistress of Choiseul. Diderot and Helvétius were caricatured in odious colours. Stanislas, king of Poland, would have dismissed Palissot from his Academy, for having written *Les Philosophes*, had not Rousseau intervened. See *Conf.*, part ii., liv. 87. In June, 1782, i.e. four years after his death, it was attempted to represent *Les Philosophes*, but when Jean Jacques entered crawling, the audience rose in indignation. See *Correspondance Littéraire of Grimm*, June, 1782.

than the assurance that all civilization is a mistake; and that the only remedy for the evils and injustices we find existing amongst us, is to drive human life back upon the path of progress, and to return, if not to four-footed tranquillity, then to a state of barbarism.

If this is a true account of the matter, if the gospel according to Jean Jacques was actually "the sorry affair" (to quote Professor Huxley) that modern critics suppose, then the effect it produced is one of the most astounding events in human history.

"It was Rousseau's work more than that of any other one man," says Mr. Morley,¹ "that France arose from the deadly decay that had laid hold of her whole political and social system; and found the irresistible energy that warded off dissolution within, and partition from without." Well, but if this "irresistible energy" was derived from the doctrines Mr. Morley attributes to Rousseau, all one can say is that the notions of men and women one hundred and thirty years ago concerning what principles are inspiring, and what destructive of hope, must have been exactly opposite to our own.

The proposition that "a tree is known by its fruits," is one, nevertheless, that commands the assent of most impartial minds. Let us see, then, whether in this instance we must reject a general truth; and allow the modern critics to convince us that in the case of Rousseau and his "gospel," men did actually gather grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles.

The first step towards a proper understanding of Rousseau's doctrine is to recognise its relationship to, or rather its place in, the great spiritual movement that went on in France during the Eighteenth Century. This movement we can at length study from the favourable position that enables us to discover, amongst many minor currents, the main stream of thoughts and events that constitutes the true life of an epoch long made dark by the smoke and glare left by that great conflagration, the Revolution. It is precisely the master-current of spiritual activity, where lives and moves the mind of France in the Eighteenth Century, that has been lost sight of by critics who have only sought and found, in this age, the example of a world that had to perish for its sins.

"This epoch of the Eighteenth or Philosophe Century," declares

¹ *Life of Rousseau*, vol. i., chap. i., p. 3. Compare this account and other of Rousseau's influence with the descriptions of him personally, as a "disease, sensualist," (vol. i., p. 257), and with such accounts of his doctrine as the following:

"The dream of human perfectibility, which nerved men like Condorcet, was a sour and fantastic mockery. The utmost men could do was to turn it Past, to obliterate the interval, to try to walk for a space in the track of a path they would hardly succeed, but endeavour might at least do something of universal degeneracy" (vol. ii., p. 120). With this description compare his own account of the sentiments that inspired him when he wrote:

"Baré de l'espoir de faire enfin triompher des préjugés et du menage et de rendre les hommes sages en leur montrant leur véritable intérêt du bonheur futur du genre humain et par l'honneur d'un langage digne d'une si grande entreprise."—Second Dialogue.

lyle,¹ "is properly the End. The End of a Social System that for more than a thousand years had been building itself together, and after that, had begun for some centuries, as human things all do, to moulder down."

No one can deny the truth of this statement, so far as it goes: the fault in it is that it does not go far enough; and that whilst concentrating attention upon the unmistakable signs of a Social System in a state of dissolution, it fails to notice the more important and interesting proofs of a newly awakened Ideal Faith, preparing the way for new order, and new forms of life.

It is the birth and steady growth of this new Ideal Faith that belong properly to France in the Eighteenth Century. As for the conspicuous signs of social corruption and decay, these are no essential characteristics of the spirit of the age; they are a portion of the inheritance received from a former age, from the "Great Century" so-called, the century of Louis XIV., that had succeeded in poisoning where it had not drained dry all those sources that in mediæval France had been springs of health and life.² This is not a matter of speculation; it is a fact of history. It was in the Seventeenth Century that France was impoverished and depopulated by exhausting wars, and the desolating persecution of the Protestants, that drove from the country, when they did not exterminate, all that was most skilled and prudent in the industrial life of France. It was in this century, too, that the demoralization of the French "Noblesse" was brought about,³ by the establishment of the extravagant court life that transformed the resident landlords on their own estates into profligate Versailles courtiers, with no employment but vicious "gallantry" or court intrigues. Again, it was not the despised Louis XV., but the universally belauded Louis XIV., who first degraded public morals, and the monarchical idea, by affording his subjects the spectacle of a most Christian king whose domestic arrangements were those of a polygamous Mussulman, and who published the fact to the world by legitimatizing the offsprings of three adulterous unions. It was under this reign, too, that the Church, once with all her faults of fanaticism the stern reposer of kings, shed the scorn as well as the hatred of all that was most moral and sane in France by her cynical toleration of vice in high places, and rational persecution of opinions.⁴

¹ *anias*, "Diderot,"—and this estimate of the age affects also Carlyle's judgment of men, and of the work done by them. For Carlyle, Voltaire is "*no great man, but persiflage*"; Diderot is "*a mechanical philosopher-sentimentalist*." Carlyle is instinct for the "original man," the "man of genius," does not let him pass the case of Rousseau, and it is to be remarked that, with all his antipathy to the Century, his judgment of the prophet of that age is more sympathetic than that of Mr. Morley. For Carlyle, Rousseau "is a deep-minded, thoughtful, wofully misarranged mortal . . . in whom nevertheless there is much as none of the others offer."—*Essay*, "Diderot."
² "*un monde*," Michelet, *Hist. de France*, vol. xiii., *France Contemporaine*, "L'Ancien Régime," liv. i., Taine.
³ The Royal were driven from their convent by the police.

A corrupt Church and court, a demoralized aristocracy, an impoverished people—here you have the legacy received from the Seventeenth Century, and no doubt if you are pleased to study the Eighteenth Century at the court of Louis XV., you will find what Carlyle calls so well the “mouldering down of the old system” going on rapidly enough until the end.

But then, whilst France in the Seventeenth Century is correctly described as the France of Louis XIV., France in the Eighteenth Century is not the France of Louis XV. at all. It is the France of Montesquieu, of Voltaire, of Diderot, until it becomes the France of Jean Jacques Rousseau. In other words, it is the France of the new Ideal Faith, destined to transform the old views of the duties, obligations, and aims of human life.

This Ideal Faith, new in its form, and in the purpose it set itself to serve, was, no doubt, a return to those animating principles of *trust in nature and in man*, that three centuries earlier, in Italy, had given the impulse to the minds and imaginations of men that had its result in what is called the Renaissance. But the leaders in the spiritual movement that belongs to France in the Eighteenth Century accepted these principles in a nobler sense, and gave them a wider application, than had been possible to the men of the Renaissance in full reaction against the dreariness, terror, and penitential restraints, imposed upon life by mediæval Catholicism. After the exuberant outburst of intellectual and artistic energy that marked the first period of the Renaissance, the genius of that movement lost itself in the vain effort to restore, together with classical culture, the conditions of feeling and the views of life that had belonged to civilized Paganism. “The minds of the Italians,” says Mr. Symonds,¹ “assimilated Paganism. In their hatred of mediæval ignorance, in their loathing of cowed and cloistered fools, they flew to an extreme and affected the manners of an irrevocable past. This extravagance led of necessity to a reaction, in the north to Puritanism, in the south to the counter Reformation.” In other words, the effort of the Renaissance failed, or was checked for a season, not solely, nor even chiefly, on account of the fanatical opposition it provoked; but because it was not in itself, or its aims, sufficient for, or satisfying to, a generation in whose consciousness were stored those treasures of sentiment, and the moral sense, purchased for humanity at the cost of centuries of material and intellectual stagnation, and of the darkening of innocent joy and of physical delight in life.

The intellectual revolt of the Eighteenth Century was animated by a more hopeful purpose than the effort to restore for men who had only grown the tranquil surroundings of the Pagan world, what Mr. Pater calls “those pronounced qualities of the Renaissance, the care for physical pleasure.”

Jansenists, even Fénelon expressing no indignation. In 1712, the law referring to persons without confession, was passed, etc.

¹ *Hist. of Renaissance*, vol. i., p. 27.

² *Renaissance*, Preface, xiii. W. Pater.

beauty, and the worship of the body." The aim of the new effort was to assert and establish the dignity and independence of the Human Spirit. Based upon belief in the health and beauty, instead of the grossness and impurity of nature; in the natural goodness, instead of the innate depravity of the human heart; in the need, instead of the peril, of cultivating the intellect, and of strengthening human reason to take the place of blind unquestioning faith; finally, in the claim of all men to justice, instead of in the divine right of a few men to special privileges and power, this new Ideal Faith demanded indeed a Revolution, a complete change from the conditions of a society founded upon the assumption that the Divine Law is arbitrary, and designed to hold in check the evil instincts of man, to the conditions required by a society recognising the laws of human nature as sacred, and the ideas of right and justice as founded upon, and derived from, the moral instincts of mankind.

This fundamental principle of *trust in nature and in man*, leading on to the common purpose of *establishing by the laws of human nature the standard of thought and conduct*, marks out the distinguished men of this epoch, notwithstanding their personal differences, as fellow-workers,—fellow-soldiers, rather, fighting in the cause and for the triumph of the spirit of the age. Wonderful, and most impressive is it, to trace this unsuspected spiritual relationship between the three great leaders who represent, severally, the three divisions of the advancing army, charged to reconquer the earth for man! Two of these leaders, Voltaire and Diderot, supposed themselves the enemies of the third, who also regarded himself always as a solitary man, at war with the tendencies of his time. And yet nothing is more clear to-day than that these supposed adversaries of Rousseau had worked to prepare his triumph; and that Rousseau, on his side, merely gave a wider application to the principles of the very men whose influence he supposed he was resisting. Before Rousseau, Voltaire had proclaimed the rights of man—one of man's chief rights, at any rate, his right to think, to use his own intellect, and to abide by its decisions. Again, before Rousseau, Diderot had appealed from false science to nature; and had declared that the observation of natural laws, and not the study of ancient authorities, is the method of true learning. But what Voltaire and Diderot did only for the intellect and the understanding, Rousseau did for the conscience and the instincts of the heart. And since even in an age of culture, the life of intelligence is for the few, whilst the life of the heart and conscience is for all, Rousseau was much more than a simple continuator of the work done by his predecessors—he opened out a new world in this work: transforming the purely intellectual movement, whose influence had been felt only by the cultivated classes, into a moral and spiritual movement, bringing invigorating principles, and new animating hopes, into the lives of men.

When you have Rousseau's place in the spiritual Revolution of the eighteenth century. Amongst philosophers, men of science and of letters,

he is the religious teacher *par excellence*; the man who has the moral fervour and the impassioned earnestness of a Spiritual Prophet. We have Rousseau appearing in mid-century; and standing there precisely where the spirit of the age had need of such a minister, to save this new effort towards "the liberation of humanity" from ending much as the Renaissance had done, in some splendid services done the intellect and imagination; but in general disappointment, as a result of the isolation of a movement, affecting only the educated classes, from the sympathies, interests, and aspirations of the mass of men. There did seem some danger of such an ending for the Eighteenth Century movement at the time of Rousseau's appearance. It was a period of great intellectual enlightenment; but of profound spiritual dryness and poverty of heart. Very much that had been heroic and humane in the first revolt against cruel and stupid bigotry was exhausted. Men were no longer animated by the generous enthusiasm for intellectual liberty that had inspired them at the commencement of the century, and the prevailing spirit of tolerance was more the result of sceptical indifference, than of any zeal for the triumph of great principles. There was need indeed for the appearance of some Prophet to recall the spiritual Revolution to a sense of its true mission, and to give it fresh vitality by associating it with the emotions and aspirations of a new religious enthusiasm.

But, now, by virtue of what strong inspiration could Rousseau win men from indifference to all questions of morals, and cynical contempt for spiritual aims, to the zeal and fervour of a new Religion? The source of his power was in the one strong inalterable belief round which all his teaching gathers—the belief that *goodness, and the love of goodness, are part of the nature of man*. It is our own judgment, Rousseau declares, and no supernatural revelation external to the heart of man, that teaches us to distinguish between good and evil. As certainly, he maintains, as physical instinct compels men to know pain from pleasure, the moral sense forces them to distinguish wrong from right; indeed, these ideas of "rightness" or "wrongness" that are attached to certain actions, are merely the result of man's instinctive perception of what agrees with, and what is repugnant to, his moral nature.¹ But, now, what a revolution in the whole sphere of thought and conduct was involved in the acceptance of this simple proposition, that the love of goodness is natural to man! Here Rousseau separated himself alike from the priests, and from the popular philosophers of his day; from those who maintained that man's nature is corrupt and inclined to evil, and from those who asserted that man naturally has no inclination either to good for its own sake, or evil for its own sake, but

¹ "La vertu, disent ils, est l'amour de l'ordre. Mais cet amour peut il donc et il l'emporter sur celui de mon bien être? Dans le fonds leur prétendu principe par jeu de mots—car je dis aussi moi que le vice est l'amour de l'ordre pris d'un différent. Il y a quelque ordre moral partout où il y a sentiment et intelligence c'est que le bon s'ordonne par rapport autout, et que le méchant on par rapport à lui."—*Vicaire Savoyard*.

that, led only by physical instinct, he seeks pleasure and avoids pain. But here Rousseau at the same time proved himself the true Prophet who met and served the spiritual tendencies of his time. In other words, the Religion he declared to his contemporaries was no strange doctrine, it was their own Religion, "the faith in nature and in man," applied to conduct as well as to opinions, and used, as supernatural faith had been used in times past, to sustain man's resolution, to strengthen his sense of duty, and to lift his views of life above worldly cares and selfish ambitions.¹

And now we are in a position to answer the question we started with: Where was the "message of good tidings," in this Religion of Nature, that woke the old world from its apathy, and "gave Europe," in Mr. Morley's words, "a new gospel"? No parables, never mind how eloquent, concerning the primitive happiness and innocence of the noble savage; no pictures of a vanished golden age, painted in glowing colours, could thus have stirred the times, or have called forth those ardent hopes and practical efforts for the regeneration of society. It was Rousseau's inextinguishable belief, in the face of the wrongs and oppressions of his day, that *justice and right belong to the nature of man*, and that *therefore* no institutions opposed to the laws of human nature are irrevocable; it was this faith that enabled him, whilst around him the old systems were crumbling down on their insecure foundations of discredited miracles, to behold the vision of the new Order built upon the indestructible facts of man's moral nature. Again, it was this faith, communicated by Rousseau to his contemporaries, that roused in them the "irresistible energy" spoken of by Mr. Morley, bringing them self-reliance, and power of self-redemption, to take the place of the lost faith in salvation by miracles, and of the despondency that followed the vanishing of that faith, a despondency the natural and necessary result of centuries of belief that "there is no power in man himself whereby he may be saved."¹

And now what justification is there for the popular notion that Rousseau disbelieved in human progress altogether, and held the belief that happiness and innocence lie behind us, lost to the race for ever with the vanished

¹ "Seul était Rousseau au milieu du siècle quand il osa dans la dispute des chrétiens et des philosophes poser le dogme nouveau: il était seul: le lendemain le monde entier fut à lui. . . . Montesquieu écrit, interprète le droit; Voltaire pleure et crie pour le droit: et Rousseau le fonde. . . . Il lut au fond de sa souffrance ce que le moyen âge n'a jamais pu lire, un Dieu juste: et, ce qu'a dit un glorieux enfant de Rousseau, 'le droit est le souverain du monde.' Rousseau l'a dit par un autre, par Mirabeau; mais ce n'est pas moins le fonds du génie de Rousseau. Du moment qu'il s'est arraché de la fausse science du temps et d'une société non moins fausse, vous les voyez poindre dans ses écrits, cette belle lumière, le devoir, le droit. L'Europe en est tout changée. . . . on critique: mais on obéit. 'Sentimentalité pure!' disent ils, en tâchant de sourire. Ils n'en suivent pas moins ce réveur. Les philosophes eux-mêmes, les abstracateurs de quinze siècles vont, malgré eux, par la voie simple du pauvre Vicaire Savoyard."—*Int. à l'hist. de la Révolution*, Michelet.

Life of Rousseau, vol. i., 134.

Rousseau's doctrine is identical with Buddha's teaching, and opposed to the Christian redemption through a Saviour's merits. Each man has the power to save himself, no other power can save him. "Pour être grand il ne faut que se rendre maître de soi-même." Rousseau (*Discours sur l'Inégalité*). "Self is the Lord of self," says Buddha. "A self well-governed man has a lord such as few can find."—*Dhammapadam*.

Eden of unashamed and naked barbarism? No doubt numerous passages might be quoted from Rousseau's writings where the corrupt conditions of society in his own day are declared to be more destructive of human happiness than the perils and hardships of the savage state. But the only authority for the assumption that Rousseau disbelieved in the possibility of progress, and regarded the savage as the type and pattern of the "natural man," is derived from those two brilliant, but paradoxical, *Essays*, the *Discourses*. Now every attentive student of Rousseau's history and writings knows that the *Discourses* do not properly count amongst his serious works at all.¹ They were composed upon themes suggested by the Academy of Dijon, at a time when he had not come to take his duties as a social Prophet seriously, but when he was merely an exasperated, unhappy man, tormented by mingled pity and indignation, and a too vivid sense of the miseries and vices of his age. It was the impression produced by the two "*Discourses*"² that brought home to their author the recognition of his power, and that woke in him the noble ambition to use this power for his own reform and the regeneration of society. And we have the best proof that this was actually as he states it, in the different tone and character of his writings after he had solemnly accepted his position as a guide and counsellor of men. All the exaggerated attacks upon civilization, all the fanciful pictures of an imaginary golden age, all the exorbitant claims made in the name of personal freedom, belong to Rousseau's irresponsible period,—in other words, are found in the *Discourses*. Studied here, they afford us interesting indications of the emotions and dreams that helped to form his genius. But once formed, this genius put dreams behind it. The author of the *New Hloise*, of the *Social Contract*, of the *Emile*, may be described as an enthusiast, but he is no dreamer of dreams. He is before all things a man who drives at practice. He is no longer for abolishing civilization, but for simplifying life; he does not preach the destruction of society, but its establishment upon the secure foundation of justice; he asserts no more that all men are absolutely free and equal, but he claims for all men equal freedom under laws established by general consent for the welfare of all.

Is this to say that in the "*Discourses*" Rousseau propounded an opposite doctrine to the one he set forth deliberately in his more serious works? Not at all. The spiritual tone and attitude of mind are different: the animating ideas and principles are still the same. To imagine that even in the *Discourses*, Rousseau's true aim and purpose are to convince men that the golden age lies behind them, is to fall into the same intellectual blun-

¹ "Qu'est ce que la célébrité?"—Rousseau writes when republishing the First *Discourse*. "Voici le malheureux ouvrage à qui je dois la mienne! Il est certain que cette pièce qui m'a valu un prix, et qui m'a fait un nom, est tout au plus médiocre; et j'ose ajouter qu'elle est une des moindres de ce recueil."

² "Comme je ne songeais plus à mon *Discours* j'appris qu'il avait remporté le prix à Dijon. Cette nouvelle réveilla toutes les idées qui me l'avaient dicté. Je ne trouvais plus rien de grand et de beau que d'être libre, vertueux, au dessus de la fortune, et de l'opinion."—*Conf.*, Part ii., liv. viii.

der those commit who imagine that Jesus sets the sinner above the saint, when He recognises the difficulty of a return to virtue in the generous outburst, "There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance"; or again, who supposes He is counselling improvidence, when He bids the worldly-minded, and those over-careful and troubled by their material needs, "to consider the lilies of the field how they grow." There is this difference between the abstract Philosopher and the moral Prophet: the former has it for his object to express invariable truths in clear and unambiguous terms, but the Prophet's purpose is not to frame faultless theories, but to bring home some special truths to special souls in need of them—in other words, to turn the hearts of men and women in the direction he sees they need to go. Rousseau saw clearly, or rather he felt strongly, the direction in which the highly cultivated, but perverted, men and women of his day needed to go. His purpose in the two *Discourses* was to arouse and alarm this polished and corrupt society, that because it was so polished and so intelligent, supposed itself the best and most perfect society the world has known. And thus we have him denouncing the false civilization, that taught men to endure the loss of sincerity and simplicity of life, for the sake of the supposed advantages of culture and material ease.

Rousseau denied the reality of these advantages; he declared that when external culture and refinement cover the neglect of the essential laws of human nature, they aggravate, rather than lessen, the misery and degradation of man, and serve only to develop in him artificial vices and morbid powers of suffering unknown to the barbarian. If, in this special instance, you think Rousseau is over-stating the case, read the Memoirs of the Duc de Richelieu, the most admired man of fashion of that day, and the typical product of the refined corruption of the period.

To read the *Discourses*, then, in their true sense, it is necessary to understand what emotions inspired them; to whom they were especially addressed; and what immediate purpose they were intended to serve. But these considerations are entirely ignored by modern scientific critics, who imagine it the easiest thing in the world to snuff out the "Gospel according to Jean Jacques" in an article. We have a curious example of the modern methods of criticising a famous writer, whose genius transformed the convictions of Europe (and who commanded the veneration of minds of such undeniable distinction as Mirabeau, the man of action *par excellence*, as Madame Roland, the ideal humanitarian, as Emanuel Kant, the abstruse philosopher, as Schiller, the heroic poet, etc.) in Professor Huxley's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for January, 1890. The Professor, undertaking to extinguish, once and for all, that "corpse-candle of Rousseauism," does not think it worth while to mention even the greatest of all Rousseau's works, the *Emile*; but he indicates the two sources of his information concerning Rousseau's doctrine, adding in the tone of a man who has no time to waste on pure rubbish, "*it is not necessary to go*

any further." The two sources of Professor Huxley's information are the *Social Contract* and the *Discourse upon Inequality*: and the critic classes these works together, as though both had the same importance, and represented in the same way their author's serious and mature opinion. It is true that Professor Huxley finds certain differences between the conclusions arrived at in the *Discourse upon Inequality*, and upon those set forth in the *Social Contract*; but it is not worth while to examine what this inconsistency on the part of a "mere rhetorician" and "sham sentimentalist" of Rousseau's sort signifies: "it is enough for me," says the Professor, with ineffable superiority, "that the same fallacious assumptions, and the same *à priori* method pervade both works."

Now what Rousseau's "assumptions" are we have seen: they may be summed up thus:—

1. That the love of goodness, taught man by his moral instincts, is as much a fact of human nature as self-love, or the love of pleasure, taught him by his physical instincts.
2. That whilst self-love gives each man interests distinct from, and often opposed to, the interests of others, the love of goodness creates moral interests that are essentially the same for all mankind.
3. That although in the case of most men self-interest is a stronger passion than the love of goodness, yet since the selfishness of each man is kept in check by the selfishness of all other men, it is the love of goodness that is the sovereign law in human life; since this law claims and commands the general consent of mankind.

Whether these assumptions are based upon facts, or are "phantoms bred of fallacious reasoning and born of the unscientific imagination," as Professor Huxley decides, we shall probably each of us determine for ourselves, by the use of the same method that the Professor condemns Rousseau for employing. In a general way, any clear-headed and rational man when told that such a process of thought, or state of feeling, "belongs to human nature," will recollect that he too is human; and will ask of consciousness, "Is this true for me?" That bugbear of the modern scientist, the "*à priori* method," needs to be more precisely defined, for the benefit of plain people who value methods only as they serve the ends of the critical faculty and help us "to see things as in themselves they really are." We all know the good story of the German idealist, who evolved a camel from his inner consciousness; but this good story is often made to do duty where it does not in the least apply. *The German's blunder was in forgetfulness that the domain of the camel is not the inner consciousness.* But it is a blunder of the same sort to look for purely objective and physical explanations of those laws of thought and conduct that have their sources in the conscience and mind of man. Now it is with these laws of thought and feeling that Rousseau has to do; and his purpose is to apply these laws to conduct in such a way as to make human life better, happier, and worthier of its noblest capabilities. This is the first object always pre-

sent to him. He is not the historian of primitive customs and usages; nor is he a scientific sociologist, interested in tracing the gradual development of existing institutions. If he were either of these, there would be some weight in the reproaches of Professor Huxley, Mr. Morley and Sir Henry Mayne, who blame him for not having spent more time in consulting authentic historical records before he ventured to speak about the state of nature, or the laws natural to man. But in reality it is not with these historical records of the conditions of savage life that Rousseau has to do, and his excursions into the territory of the historian and sociologist are made more for the sake of illustrations than of proofs, to help his main arguments. When Rousseau speaks of the "natural man," he does not mean the savage man, but man as he is when ruled by the simple laws of nature. "*Taking men as they are, and laws as they might be,*" he says himself, he seeks to discover on what secure and just principles society may be established. In the *New Héloïse* he considers from this point of view, the life of the affections; in the *Social Contract* he deals with politics and the mutual obligations of the citizen and the state; in the *Emile* we have the same principles applied to education and Religion: and thus, taken together, these three works constitute one great effort to found life on the moral nature of man.

In a study of this sort, I can do no more than give a general outline of Rousseau's doctrine, *as a whole*; but let us see what were the religious convictions of this Prophet to a sceptical age, and how far there is any truth in the assertion, that by reviving sentiments and beliefs it had been the effort of the Eighteenth-Century philosophy to destroy, "he led a reaction." In dealing with the religious aspirations of mankind, we find Rousseau separating himself again from the sceptics, on the one hand, and from the dogmatists on the other, to consult the facts of human nature. The existence of God, Rousseau maintains, is made known to man by the order of nature, and by the law of right revealed through the human conscience. No difficulties the sceptics can throw in the way of the belief that there is a Divine intelligence at the centre of things, can match the difficulty of supposing that order has come by accident out of chaos; or that the moral instinct in man that teaches him to recognise a law higher than, and often opposed to, his selfish instincts, has no origin outside of and higher than physical needs. Therefore, by the exercise of the natural faculties, Rousseau maintains we arrive at the conviction that God is. We see Him everywhere in His works, we feel Him within ourselves, we find Him everywhere in the active life around us. But if we attempt to know God in Himself, away from nature and the human spirit, He escapes us, and we have only some idol of our own imagining to hide from us what is truly Divine within and around us. And in the same way that we know God in nature, we know the soul in man. We know the soul by its work in us; by the aspirations that carry us beyond the pains and pleasures of bodily existence; by the conviction known to every unsophisticated human being, that there dwells a

spirit within him. But, now, has this spirit any existence apart from human conditions? does it survive the body? is it immortal? Again Rousseau answers, he does not know. The indestructible hope he finds in himself, and in other men, that the spirit that dwells within him exists for some higher end than is reached in the brief life of man, constitutes, he says, a stronger argument in favour of the prolonged existence of the soul than any of the arguments that can be set against it. But this instinctive hope furnishes men with no grounds for laying down dogmas concerning the soul's immortality. Religion, natural Religion, Rousseau concludes, does not depend for proofs upon matters that lie beyond the sphere of human experience. It has its evidence in nature and in man. Religion, then, whilst it brings to morality a sacred force and power, can never contradict morality, or outrage the instincts of humanity, or lend Divine authority to doctrines condemned by reason or by conscience. What is more, no supernatural revelation is needed to make plain to men the will of God, whose law is written in their own moral nature. These supernatural revelations, Rousseau declares, have never added anything to our knowledge of God. They have served only to disfigure and degrade our natural conceptions of Him, and so far from helping to dispel the mystery that veils Him, these pretended revelations have helped to envelop Him in clouds and darkness. "What," Rousseau asks, "can supernatural Religion do that natural Religion has not already done? Natural Religion teaches men to love their fellow-men, to subdue and control their physical instincts by the higher impulses and desires of their moral nature. When supernatural Religion does more than this, it becomes mischievous. It makes men proud, intolerant, disdainful. Instead of establishing peace on earth, it brings a sword. Instead of uniting men of all races in the service and love of God, it splits up men of the same race into different sects, and teaches them to hate and despise each other."

Here, then, you have Rousseau's Religion—or, if you prefer it, his idealism. It was no return to the old idealism that had its source and fount of inspiration outside of nature; and that could be reached only by those who were willing to put off nature and the natural man, and to ascend in some garb of transformed feeling to the Divine Presence. The Divine Presence was made manifest in nature, and those who could not feel it there, would never find it. As for the Divine law, it was one with the law of man's moral nature, and hence obedience to God meant, as the Eastern prophet of natural Religion proclaimed centuries ago, self-government.

But Rousseau himself felt and adored the Divine Presence in nature, and recognised in man a spiritual sense giving him a higher law than the one of his physical instincts and appetites. Do these two articles of faith justify the assertion that Rousseau led a sentimental reaction against the principles of the Eighteenth-Century philosophy? No doubt many of his contemporaries did take this view, when they found a writer who had once been patronized by the Encyclopædists, opposing the dogmatic materialism

of that school; but then this view only proved the short-sightedness of those who held it. As a matter of fact, the Eighteenth-Century philosophy could, less than any other philosophy, exist upon a materialistic basis; because, deriving its authority from man, it was sapping its own foundations when it denied those faculties in man on which the worth of all its claims depended. The watchwords of this philosophy at starting had been freedom for thought; the rights of the individual conscience; the competency of human reason to decide all matters of opinion. But now, what became of these superb claims put forward in the name of humanity, if human beings were only what Diderot, Helvetius, Holbach, and all the school of later philosophers declared them to be, mere animals; a little higher by the head than other animals, but in no sense different from other animals in their subjection to physical laws, and their necessary obedience to the impulses of selfish instincts? If this were so, and men were incapable of regulating their own actions by any higher law than that of self-interest, then how could beings without freedom of will claim the right, or the power, to think freely? If man is incapable of performing a disinterested action, then he is also incapable of forming an impartial judgment. And thus all the claims for intellectual freedom fell to the ground, and the priests had it their own way when they declared man by nature sunk in ignorance, and only brought to a knowledge and love of the truth by means of the triple miracle of revelation, regeneration and grace. Again, how absurd to speak of the rights of the individual conscience, if conscience were only, as Diderot maintained, the result of the accumulated experience of the race concerning what actions and qualities are useful, and what injurious, in their results. If this were so, then how could the experiences of an individual have any weight when compared with the experiences of the mass of men? and what value had the speculations of a generation when these contradicted the most cherished beliefs of seventeen centuries? So that here again the materialists were playing into the hands of the school of authority, and preparing the way for a reaction; whilst it was Rousseau who was in truth confirming and carrying to their logical conclusions the principles of the spiritual Revolution.

The return to nature then preached by Rousseau was not a return to brute nature, but to human nature.¹ By this return to nature no legitimate conquest of the human spirit would be sacrificed: all that would be left behind would be what is unnatural; artificial habits, acquired needs, conventional distinctions that divide men by arbitrary barriers, conventional obligations that lay burthens on them nature never appointed,—how much the poorer would human life be for the loss of these? On the other hand, all things true, good, beautiful and noble would be grasped more

¹ "Rousseau thought and talked about the state of nature, because all his world was thinking and talking about it," says Mr. Morley, vol. i., p. 156. To see how differently from his contemporaries Rousseau thought and talked about nature, and a return to nature, compare with his views those of Saint Lambert, given in *Madame d'Épinay's Mémoires*, vol. i., p. 220.

firmly as the result of a return to nature that would mean only the verification of man's true possessions. Religion, politics, education, art, all these traced back to their sources in those sentiments and emotions that are the common gifts of mankind, would be regenerated and refreshed by a renewed sense of their vital connection with the indestructible facts of human nature, and the indispensable needs of the Human Spirit. Such a fulfilment of Rousseau's vision of "life as it might be," must still be waited for. But it is difficult to-day to estimate the true value and worth of what has actually been accomplished through his influence. Ideas and tendencies that seem interwoven with all the active aspirations of modern thought and feeling, are accepted as the spontaneous growths of the mind of to-day; and "a generation forgetful of Rousseau and the Revolution," as Michelet has it, has lost sight of its obligations to the great-hearted Prophet, broken-hearted ere his task was done, who, in the days when men were travellers in the desert of the old world, smote the rock; and, in a passion of anger, pity and love, gave the multitude to drink of those waters of health that enabled them to pass on to the conquest of the Promised Land, he himself beheld only as a vision.

Nothing, of course, can be easier than to prove that the modern spirit has outrun the sentiments, and modes of expression, of the *New Héloïse*, the *Social Contract* and the *Emile*, the three great Works that constitute the "Gospel according to Jean Jacques." Not the less true is it that these three Books have proved founts of inspiration to the modern world. "*Rousseau*," said that eminent Swiss critic known to English readers as the author of "*Amiel's Diary*," "*was at once more, and less, than a philosopher; he was a sower of ideas, a discoverer of sources. And observe,*" adds Amiel, "*that all the ideas sown by Rousseau have come to flower.*" And this is so true that if we examine the whole field of human life to-day, and ask ourselves whence come the ideas and ideals that claim especially to have borne fruit in the modern world, we shall find that all these fruitful ideas have sprung from some seed of Rousseau's planting.

In Politics, it was Rousseau¹ who first introduced moral elevation into that dreary science, by convincing men that right, and not might, is the secure foundation for social order; and by awakening that new conception of "the people," that expresses itself in the mingled reverence and compassion of what is now described as the "democratic sentiment."

In Education,² again, it was Rousseau who first liberated the Child—that innocent victim of the doctrine of innate depravity,—from the old penitential system; and who in the plan sketched in the *Emile* of an education that should follow, instead of contradicting, the method of nature, gave Pestalozzi and Froebel the first idea of the Kindergarten, and established the principles of all our modern theories of education.

¹ "Ceux qui voudraient traiter séparément la politique et la morale n'entendront jamais rien à aucune des deux."—*Emile* liv. iv.

² "La véritable éducation consiste moins en préceptes qu'en exercices."—*Emile*, liv. i.

Again, in Art and Literature, it was Rousseau who banished formal classicism, and who introduced that true inspiration drawn from nature and from life that, after the lapse of a century, still continues to be the animating influence in the imaginative life of our own day. In Religion, too, in the days when the bigot and the atheist seemed to dispute between them for the possession of the earth and sky, it was Rousseau who fearlessly proclaimed the modern faith,—the faith that, whilst creeds and dogmas vanish, and all temples made with hands must inevitably crumble into dust, God still manifests Himself to those who have eyes to see Him in the magnificent spectacle of nature, still speaks to those who will hear His voice in the higher instincts and aspirations of man.

HUMANITY.

BY FREDERIC HARRISON.

It now becomes my duty, in the course of this series of addresses on the Religious Systems of the World, to present to you—not Positivism as a system—but the simple idea of Humanity as a centre of spiritual activity and faith.

I feel myself, in the company of the learned men who have preceded me in this course, under no small disadvantage and difficulty. They have all represented some type of theology or of transcendentalism; they all deal with a superhuman and extra-mundane world, assuming that there is no possible centre of spiritual life, but in the conception of a Creator, of some spirit of the universe, of some mystical force neither comparable to Man nor akin to Man. They speak of gods, of revelation, of heaven, of an eternity of consciousness, wherein this earthly life is to be a mere trivial moment of time.

I can claim none of these grounds of confidence and hope. The only centre of spiritual life of which I have any assurance is to be found on earth; the only revelation that I can announce is that which is to be gathered from science, physical and moral, cosmical and social. And my heaven is here. It is often asked, "How can we talk of religion at all, and what meaning has the term Spiritual Life, or Soul, or Immortality, in a human and a mundane system?" As a matter of fact, we who hold to it have in many ways a sympathy, both deep and real, with the essential ideas and the spiritual aims of many of the creeds, of all of the living Churches, I would say. On the bill which announces these lectures I read the words of the Persian poet: "The object of all Religions is alike. All men seek their beloved; and all the world is love's dwelling." Heartily do I re-echo these words. The inner object of all Religions is alike. All men seek in Religion the highest ideal of love. And the highest ideal of love that I know does truly dwell in the world and is found everywhere in the world.

That which marks off the Positive scheme of life from all the known Religions in the past or in the present is this: that it seeks to found its creed exclusively on what may be proved by strict scientific reasoning—by the same logical processes by which we calculate the orbit of a comet, or explain the origin of a political revolution. That is to say, its whole religious scheme lies within the field of natural and social science, as accepted by competent minds in the present day.

On the other hand, that which marks off the Positive scheme from all

purely scientific systems of thought is this: that it makes religion the beginning and end of life, seeking to inspire every corner of life with a living sense of devotion to an over-ruling Providence. That is to say, its essential spirit is entirely in line with the spiritual aim of the known Religions of mankind, and is in direct contrast with all the Agnostic, Atheist, Materialist, and Indifferentist types of thought, which treat human nature as well able to go on without definite Religion of any kind, and have nothing to say about Spiritual Life, or Devotion, or Providence at all.

Religion and Science have hitherto stood in hopeless antagonism, notwithstanding a thousand hollow truces and verbal *formulae* of reconciliation. Religion, in all its hitherto known types, bases its creed on something other than Science, in the ordinary sense of the word. In these latter days theological Religion often assures us that it has no feud with Science, that it accepts science (in its own place)—but that place is not in its creeds, formularies, scriptures, or sermons. Science, admitting as it often does, that Religion has its own place and proper methods of seeking truth, treats theology as a sphere of knowledge *sui generis*, the canons and aims of which lie entirely outside of scientific demonstration, inductive proof, and of anything properly described as the science of Nature and of Man.

Now the meaning of the Religion of Humanity is simply this: that the science of Nature and of Man, duly concentrated on the development of human life on earth, itself forms a complete, real, and living Religion, at once spiritual and scientific.

It was the great conception of Auguste Comte—simply consolidating ideas which had been gathering form for a century—that the HUMANITY, which for generations had been the real inspiration of all great spirits and the object of all the noblest human effort, afforded the common ground of union between Science and Religion. And he showed us how, in this new centre of belief and of duty, Religion might find its creed in Science, and Science might find its crown in Religion; neither of the two sacrificing anything, but both uniting in one work.

Thus Positivism supplies what is at once Scientific Religion and Religious Science, according as we look at it from the point of view of emotion or of reflection.

Captious objections are often taken to this use of the terms, Religion, Spiritual Life, Worship, Soul, and so forth. It is said that Religion implies a Creator, the relation of man in some form to the Universe, and an explanation of its origin. That Spiritual Life means the activity of an immortal and transcendental spirit, that Soul means an immaterial entity, detachable from a human body, and quite capable of conscious thought and feeling, without any tangible substratum of matter whatever. That Worship is the adoration of the Unseen and supernatural Creator of the Universe and of Him alone.

That is a mere question of words. And even if Positivists were using words in a new sense, they would have a right to do so, if they made it clear what that sense was.

Religion, in its widest sense, means the combination of *belief in*, and *eneration for*, the Power which man regards as exercising the dominant influence over his whole life. In the theological epochs or systems this has usually been taken to mean some kind of god. But the idea of a god is not an essential part of religion. The essence of Religion lies in the belief in a power which dominates man's life, and determines it for good or for bad—such belief strong enough to generate veneration for that Power and habitual submission to what is thought to be its will. The Confucianism of China is a real religion; but it is a frank worship of the visible Heaven and the tangible Earth. All the forms of Astrolatry, the Sun-worship, Star-worship, Fire-worship, all the many varieties of Nature-worship, where the idea of a special immanent God is not yet developed, are all forms of worship of a Power which is neither a Person nor a Spirit. Buddhism, Tãoism, Shintoism, were types of the religious sentiment directed to an object which was not a personal God. The primeval religions of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, India, Greece and Rome, the various Fetish Religions of Africa, of Polynesia, and America, were all forms of worship without any thought of a single Creator in the Christian sense. It is only in certain parts of Asia and Europe, and in a few ages of theology, Jewish, Christian, or Mahometan, that Religion has ever implied belief in a Creator; for the vast masses of mankind, and for the great bulk of the ages, religion has meant the reverence man pays to the Powers which he thinks dominate his life.

So too the term *soul* means the sum of a man's noblest feeling and energy; even theologians so use it, as in the morning hymn:—

"Awake, my soul, and with the sun
Thy daily stage of duty run."

Here Soul means the energies of heart, mind, and body; for, of course, the immaterial, eternal entity does not need the refreshment of sleep.

So *spiritual life*, *worship*, are now commonly associated with a particular theory of the human organism and of the origin of the world. But in themselves these venerable words really mean—Man's yearnings about the critical ends of his existence, and Man's expression of veneration for what he feels to be the noblest being in the world.

Language is broader and older than any philosophic theory; and these fine old terms are not to be cut down to suit a particular school of opinion. May we not speak of *chivalry*, *enthusiasm*, or *inspiration*, unless we are thinking of knights in armour, or the divine afflatus of some god? The real question is not as to the derivation or linguistic history of particular terms, but whether *spiritual life* be, or be not, a permanent fact in man's nature; and if it be, what can be its meaning for us?

The bulk of the schools, which take their stand on science, either flatly

condemn *spiritual life* as a mischievous sentimentalism, or else give it the go-by with some half-sincere, conventional phrase. We must always distrust a philosophy which cannot make up its mind about the greatest of all problems; and especially must we distrust the scheme of thought, which, offering a mere lip-homage to the central ideas of Theology, finds no place for them in its own synthesis, and has only a few vague phrases to suggest in respect to them.

But it can be shown that spiritual life is a permanent factor in human existence. Our deepest thoughts about human nature bring us always back to this—Here am I, here are millions apparently such as I, set like motes in the sunbeam, surrounded by a vast environment of circumstance; distinct from it, yet unable to exist without it, able to influence it up to a certain point and under certain conditions, and influenced by it perpetually. What is it—this environment—of what nature, under whose control? Does any invisible Power behind it feel or care for me? How can I make myself secure in presence of a Force so gigantic, so ubiquitous, so changeable, so mysterious? And if I perish in the struggle, is the grave the end of my strivings and my sufferings, of my hopes and fears? In one word, what is the relation of Man to the World in which he finds himself, apparently and at times, as helpless as a new-born babe?

Science and Philosophy, which have nothing definite to say on all this, are retiring from their true task, and cannot hold men's minds very long. The instinct of all good men and women pronounces a man without any genuine religion—to whom the relation of man to the world is a question that must be thrust aside—to be a source of danger and corruption to his fellow-men and the society in which he lives, for to harden one's mental habit into this indifferentism is anti-social, shallow, materialist, or indolent.

Let us see what answer modern Philosophy can make to the eternal question:—What is the ultimate relation of man to the world around him, and what his duty to his fellow-men, and to himself?

Down to this century, and for a hundred centuries before, the divisions and complexity of the human race had hidden out of sight the dignity and the unity of Humanity.

And, moreover, man, who had given a thousand answers to the question, What is the supreme power over my life? had always sought for some *absolute* Power. By absolute, is meant a Power co-extensive with the Universe, one which dominated all men and all things without limit or condition. Religion in a thousand forms has gone on repeating, What is the Supreme Power over me, and all men, and all things? What is the will of this Supreme Power? How can I please him? how can I get his blessing?

The Positive philosophy, as a whole, summed up the secular controversy by a word: "It is a metaphysical assumption that there is any Absolute Supreme Power, dominant at once over you, and all mankind, and all

things. We cannot prove the contrary; but we cannot prove the assertion; and, with our finite and relative powers of mind, it is unphilosophical to try to prove the existence of an infinite or absolute Existence, seeing that we cannot conceive what it means, except by negations which lead to nothing."

You yourself have power over many things here and there. Mankind has vast power over many things everywhere. Mankind has a vaster and a nobler power over you than all other things put together. And you can work with mankind, and live with mankind, in a way that you cannot with inorganic things. And you can feel and show a gratitude to the sum of mankind, as you cannot feel or show to the sum of the world around you. Again, much of you yourself is good and noble. Far more in mankind around you is good and noble. But much, very much, in the world around you is cruel, wasteful, terrible, antipathetic.

Humanity in the sum, abstracting all its errors, failures, and waste, is greater, nobler, wiser, more akin to you than the world. Theology, in spite of its dogmas of human depravity, dogmas which remind one of a parent scolding a child, always admitted this. For it conceived the admission (on terms, be it said) of every human soul into heaven, whilst it never conceived that a tree, or a rock, or a flash of lightning, could ever inherit Paradise.

Humanity is different from the physical world around us, as is each human soul. It can transform the world, escape from it, use it, enslave it—but always within limits and on condition, whilst remaining utterly dependent on it for bare life, and for everything which it has. Thus, said Auguste Comte, merely condensing the wave of enthusiasm and inspiration which swept over Europe in the eighteenth century, the Supreme Power over your life, which for thousands of years men have searched for in the skies, is here, on earth, beside you, and of you; it is heard in the whisper of husband and wife in love, of mother and child, in the word of friend, teacher, leader, and chief; it is in the boundless past of history, and the undreamed ages to come; it is in every true deed, and in the still small voice within you.

Only, it is in no absolute sense supreme; in no literal sense mighty, or wise, or good. It has not created the world; it does not control the world; it is not responsible for the world, with its terrible waste and ruin.

Humanity, though the vastest and the noblest organism of which we have any sure apprehension, is itself dependent on the world, on the earth where it dwells, and the heaven where it breathes. It cannot add one minute to the day, or draw one cloud from the sky; it is as an infant before the storm, and a waif in the earthquake. But though it cannot stem or guide the forces of Nature, it can adapt them, avoid them, and make them its servant.

It is impossible to doubt the reality of this great Organism, or to withdraw from its sphere, or cease to join in its collective life. Even Robinson,

Crusoe only lived as an intelligent being on the waifs and strays of civilization which he brought with him from the wreck. Of any Supreme Being, paramount at once over the Moral Sphere and over the Physical Sphere, we can say nothing positive. There may be such a Being; as Comte says, there may be such a Being in our solar system, or what we call the Solar System may be such a Being. But our scientific certainty cannot grasp it, if there be. Our minds seem cast in an unalterably dual mould—body and mind side by side, neither to be resolved into the other. The human and the material world confront us in every aspect, our whole field of knowledge being grouped into correlations of object and subject, of observation and meditation, of law and will, of action and passion, necessity and freedom, morality and its inexorable conditions.

Henceforth, then, with this eternal Dualism in human life, this perpetual play of Function and Organism, of Organism and Environment, of action and limitation, of difficulty and duty, of knowledge and obstacle—that is of correlation everywhere—let us desist from the vain search after one Supreme Power, dominant over Man and Nature, the moral and the physical world, and at last recognise that there stand before us not one great Force, but two Forces, the World and Humanity.

First, is the World: imposing fixed and unalterable conditions on man, not being itself moral, and apparently not guided by moral feeling at all; neither itself omniscient, and apparently not guided by omniscience; so far as we can see, not at all benevolent to us, and yet not malevolent, but feeding us or crushing us with the same calm indifference.

Next is humanity—nobly submitting to these limits, exerting glorious intelligence and energy in modifying them; but really akin to us, moral, benevolent, as well as beneficent; raising us, whilst it raises itself, in comparison with each fleeting mortal, eternal, and immortal; in comparison with each individual unit, of boundless sagacity, power, and goodness; for ever caring for us and sustaining us, whatever we may do; practically, whatever we may think of it, an idealized Mother of us all, and more than human Father of us all.

No scepticism or cynicism can get rid of this, if we think it out. The most bitter misanthrope, the most noisy satirist of human nature, can only live, act, think, or speak, by the aid of the various products, achievements, and appliances of civilization, which, if he discard, he becomes a raving lunatic.

This, then, is the positive answer to the problem of life. The kingdom of Humanity is within you, and within all men. The great Being, whom to love is to serve, and whom to know is to worship, has been within us all from the first dawn of human life on the planet. Serve him by living aright. He, like ourselves, is subject to the world we live in. But his dignity, wisdom, and goodness, consist in his ordering his life in due relation to this world and its laws. And what, then, is the will of this great Power, but, in no absolute or theological sense, Supreme Power? What

can it be, but the law of his own being which is only the vaster and fuller expression of the law of our own being, a right life in accordance with the intellectual laws, the industrial laws, the physical laws, the statical and historical laws of human society, as revealed by the entirety of science.

The revelation, the inspiration, the incarnation so long and passionately dreamed of by the religious souls of men through such a long vista of ages, are realized at last. The true revelation of the will of the great Being is science itself. Human genius and love is that Inspiration. The sum of demonstrated Law is the Gospel. The Bible of the Hebrews, the Gospel of Christ and of Paul, becomes a real, but a simple, part of the true Gospel. There is no one Book of the Law. All great books alike reveal the Law. All great thinkers and teachers, all true workers and rulers have been inspired. There is no single incarnation of the son of a carpenter and a maiden of Judah. Humanity is incarnate in all great men in a supreme degree ; it is incarnate in every worthy man and woman alike ; every son of Humanity, who does not repudiate his birthright, is the son of Man, is a Christ, is or may be, the Messiah, of some honest family or home ; every true daughter of Humanity is, at least in nature, the mother or the sister of some Christ to be,—is herself a transfigured type of Humanity itself.

The will of our Great Being is a true and useful life in accordance with a wise education in all essential knowledge. The law of our religion is the law expounded in the sum of science. The personality of our Highest is typified in the best and wisest of mankind, and is summed up in one great ideal of Humanity. The worship of this Being is the development of human life in all its phases, the fusing through every vein of all that is pure, bright, and generous.

But this, it is sometimes said, is only the Christian religion, at least in the broad, undogmatic, and comprehensive form which it is wont to take in the hands of modern teachers, who are not bound by the formularies, articles, and churches of the past. This is quite true ; but this broad Neo-Christianity is always most purposely vague, and is often most uncandidly mysterious. It adopts the language of Humanity, whilst professing a nominal loyalty to all kinds of superhuman figments and conventions. Our Positive creed is, in spiritual essence and meaning, in harmony with the best religious spirit of those followers of Christ who dwell more on the Humanity than the Godhead of Christ, and to whom the brotherhood of the human race is more definite and important than the creation of the Universe, or the attributes of the Trinity.

But then our Positive creed is a religious scheme which definitely rests from beginning to end on real scientific bases, which is not a medley of natural and supernatural, of the certain and the hypothetical, of earth and the universe, the known limitations of man on earth, and the infinite possibilities of an absolute and incomprehensible Omniscience. Our Positive creed is truly the best religious spirit which survives others in the nine-

teenth century, made rational and limited to fact, and *minus* dreams about superhuman worlds of which we know nothing and can guess anything; *minus* the narrow superstition that would limit inspiration to one race, one epoch, one type of human goodness; *minus* the extravagance which would turn history upside down by interpolating a supposed god into the very middle of human evolution; and especially *minus* the degrading and inhuman nonsense about Hell, Devil, Damnation, Fall, Atonement, Chosen People, Vicarious Sacrifice, Predestination, Wrath of God, and Special Providence.

Get rid of all this rubbish, and everything to which it leads up and on which it rests, and we shall at last have a real religion, retaining the spiritual yearnings which these figments of ignorant priests were devised to satisfy.

The Broad Church, however Broad, even when vaporized away till it becomes a thin spectral Theism, flavoured with the Sermon on the Mount, never can frankly throw overboard the fundamental bases of all Gospel teaching, which rest on the Wrath of God and Personal Salvation by Divine Grace. All this makes an imposing scheme for a *City of God*, a *Divine Comedy*, or a *Paradise Lost*, but is utterly incompatible with Science, History, and positive Ethics.

But, it is sometimes asked, Is this collective Humanity a real thing? Men, saturated with the unintelligible formulæ of metaphysicians and theologians, taught to think of the object of their worship as an unthinkable assemblage of negative attributes, ask us—if Humanity is real? Real! Is a family a real thing? Is the English nation real? or the Anglo-Saxon race? Are these abstractions? What more do we mean by collective abstraction, except the abstract or mental association of a number of real persons who act together, in real ways, and who will continue to act together, talk one tongue, believe in their common origin, share common ideas, and form an organic society of some kind.

In one sense Humanity is far more real than family, nation, or race, because it is a permanent and not a temporary association; one which, so far as we can see, will co-exist with the habitable conditions of the planet (and for practical purposes these are sufficiently stable); it is a society which visibly grows more united and organic; and of which the power over nature is increasing with wonderful strides.

Humanity is more real than any individual, because Humanity suffices for itself, and can live, and does live, a life of its own. But no individual really lives a life of his own, or could survive a week absolutely by himself, or can look forward to more than a few precarious years of conscious activity. Humanity is certainly real, if it is composed wholly of real persons, lives a real life, and effects real things. It is difficult to understand the state of mind which rejects humanity as an *abstraction*, and clings to God because He is *real*. In what sense can Humanity be called an abstraction, if God is not an abstraction? Is the crew of a ship that sails

round the world all working and living together an abstraction, or a regiment of soldiers, or the Catholic Church? None of these are Persons, nor are they (physically speaking) tangible organisms. But they are all social organisms: made up of persons, the tangible organisms which we see, in part, visibly co-operating to a perceptible result, and which, in part, we know to have social succession and mental and moral filiation of impulses and ideas. And this real organic assemblage of human lives is thought by some people to be a phrase of logic when compared with the reality of an Absolute Omnipotence, whom the metaphysicians assure us, in and out of the pulpit, must be regarded as an unthinkable assemblage of negative attributes, each contradicting one another!

Where you have a body of real persons working together and effecting real things, having a succession of aims and ideas, carrying on one common scheme for centuries, where, as with the Catholic Church or the English nation, you can write its history over a thousand years, and trace the laws of its growth, development, decay or disturbances—there you have a real power, around which a complete body of sympathies and beliefs, hopes and faiths, can engraft themselves and grow.

What more is wanted for the basis of a religion? Some people say an Almighty God. But why an Almighty God, if the history of mankind shows that this idea is only a partial and a very late development of the religious imagination? And if it can be shown that the highest and strongest effects of religion have often been called forth by other and more practical and human types of power?

It is sometimes said that worship implies a Person. That may be true of *worship* in the technical and arbitrary sense which it has acquired in modern theology. But if no one pretends or seeks to *adore* Humanity, if the only worship intended is a lively sense of gratitude and respect, and a practical desire to live and die in its cause, then Humanity is an adequate object of a rational and practical devotion. Men have lived and died for their country, their republic, their Church, their city, their tribe, and no theological faith has ever inspired a more passionate devotion and a more intense love than has Country and Cause in certain epochs. A cause, a community, in the future of which you believe, towards which your soul is filled with gratitude and affection, for the sake of which you are ready to give effort, and to sacrifice even life itself, is all that men need as an object of real and manly devotion.

Perhaps not of such devotion as makes the Catholic mystic water his cell with tears, and waste his life in genuflections; or of such devotion as leads the Calvinist bigot to condemn his own child in thought to eternal torment, because he has his own opinion as to an old Hebrew story-book; perhaps not of devotion such as this. But we want no such devotion. All that we want is the manly but enthusiastic will to do honour to the true Country or the just Cause.

And Humanity is the grandest of all causes, the vastest and most per-

manent of all communities, the great country of all nations and all races. It is sometimes said that Humanity, with all its imperfections, weakness, and corruptions is an impossible object of genuine respect. Of such adoration and prostration as is paid to Perfect Omnipotence it might be. But no such adoration or prostration is asked for, and none such is henceforth of moral service to man.

We owe duty and gratitude to parents, to family, cause, and country, though we know them all to be faulty and inadequate in many ways and in many things. Is our gratitude and our devotion to our country dried up when we discover bad men amongst us and errors committed by our fellow-countrymen? Does patriotism necessarily mean "Our country right or wrong!" From a relative stand-point, absolute conditions of human sentiment are as morally injurious as they are intellectually feeble. We are human from birth to the grave; and our human development should be frankly trained on human ideals to a human standard of merit, if not of perfection.

It is said, too, that science gives us no positive assurance of an absolute eternity of the human race. Of no *absolute* eternity, it may be. But for practical purposes 100,000 years are as good as eternity—at least they are forty times the period within which civilization has existed in Europe, and history has begun, and they are five or six times the period over which we have any record of the human race as such. Those who crave the empty satisfaction of an unimaginable eternity, must satisfy it by any fancies that they please, remembering that knowledge cannot grasp eternity. For the manly conduct of life, indefinite duration is all that a healthy mind can seek.

How cynical should we think it if a man told us that he could not feel any interest in his family, because a few generations would probably bring it to an end; if he could feel no affection for his father, because in a few years it would be a mere memory; if a man were to sneer at patriotism, because in a few centuries the New Zealand traveller would be sitting on the ruins of London Bridge. We should feel all such gibes to be the proof of a narrow mind and a cold heart. Humanity is practically immortal when contrasted with man, family, country, or race. We know of nothing that can kill or waste it whilst the conditions of the Solar System remain; and we know nothing that can affect the conditions of the Solar System within measurable æons of time. And are gratitude, devotion, and duty to be reduced to a question of time? Are these sentiments incapable of life, save with revealed assurances of an absolute and incomprehensible eternity? Those who set monkish metaphysics above healthy action and rational thought must find what assurance they can in Biblical exegesis and Mediæval poems. We find a more abiding peace in Science, History, and Social Ethics.

Observe another most comforting quality in this new-found object of religious faith, or rather in this new conception of the old object of it.

religious faiths. Every idea of a Supreme Being, regarded as Supreme over the Universe as well as over man, necessarily appeals to the believer's own spirit. He communes with his God in secret and is at rest. That is to say, he retires into his own inner consciousness, and *pro tanto*, he withdraws himself from his fellow-men. Whatever comes between the Creature and his Maker, even his fellow-creatures, to the devotee who imagines himself to be face to face with his Creator, and his Creator to be whispering to his heart in secret, all this is necessarily of minor account, and so far as it intrudes on the mystic and beatific colloquy, is earthly, profane, and deadening to the soul.

Hence, theology is in its essence a thing of subjective visions, appealing to the individual self-consciousness at its highest moment of exaltation, and putting the whole human race and all its interests in a secondary and even in an antagonistic place. All theological religions have made desperate efforts to counteract this tendency. The unknown Humanity which inspired them has made them always nobly superior to their creed. But self has mastered them all in the long run, dragged them down, and made them minister to self-will; so that in the end the terrible alternative that every theologian has to face comes to an issue—either sacrifice the Creed, or admit that it is in direct conflict with human progress. The bigot, Catholic or Calvinist, accepts the latter. But all good Christian men are slowly and awkwardly divesting themselves of the Creed. And on what does their religion rest then? It rests on fine words and fantastic accommodations of plain old dogmas, and direct unmistakable promises and threats.

The new (or to speak truly) the old, religion of Humanity is social in its essence. It finds the object of religious respect and submission in the vast community, of which the believer and his fellow-men are only part. It makes no effort to eliminate from its creed self-concentration and a dream of individual salvation; none is needed. For its essence is to love and serve others in the sum. The society of Mankind forms its creed. That which is anti-social is of its own nature anti-religious. And the health and development of each human soul with us means nothing but its active contribution to the health and development of the human souls around it.

Souls, we say. Have we souls? Of course we have. Positivists as much as Christians know what it means when a man gives his whole soul to his work. It is idle to bar us from the use of a fine old word, because we decline to associate with it a particular metaphysical theory. Believers in *Metempsychosis* might as well try to debar all men from using the word *soul*, unless they accept the doctrine of the transmigration of souls; or believers in *Spiritualism* might as well pretend that no one could speak of a spiritual character or a spiritual poem, unless he accepts the nonsense about ghosts, telepathy, and table-turning. Happily no one can take out a patent for the exclusive use of words as old as human language, nor

forbid the use of them, except in connection with some fanciful theory of their own.

Does this soul or spirit exist independently of the body, of body at all, in a purely immaterial state? Who can say? Where is the proof that it does? How can we have any opinion about what may occur in a world where all the conditions of human knowledge are *ex hypothesi* absent? It is a question to which I can offer no answer, and as to which I can imagine no rational answer, negative or affirmative. Do immaterial entities, called souls, exist in space, without any physical organism whatever? I do not know. Is the Universe charged with Abracadabras? I do not know. I cannot say No, and I cannot say Yes. If you like to think so, I shall not dispute it. I have something else to think about, and something else to do.

It has always seemed to me odd, that those who find it dreadful to suppose that a human soul ceases to be, find no difficulty in conceiving an enormous period of time before each mortal life, when the immortal soul did not exist. How could an eternal entity not exist in any period of time? What was the soul doing then? Is it not terrible to suppose these eternal entities not existing, whilst their more fortunate brother-souls were in existence for millions of years? How can the existence of an infinite eternal entity have a definite term at the beginning and no definite term at the end of its life? And why is a definite term at the close of earthly life more horrible to contemplate than a definite term at the opening of earthly life? Or if it be said that devout Christians do not believe in any definite term at either end, and that the Churches abstain from dogmatizing about the ante-natal state of the soul, they certainly tell us nothing positive about it. But that is exactly my own state of mind as to the *post-mortem* state of the soul. I abstain from dogmatizing; and now, after many wasted years of meditation, I abstain even from speculating as to the state of the soul, both before and after earthly life. I accept the logical position for both ante-natal and *post-mortem* existence, which has been the orthodox view as to the ante-natal existence. Pythagoras, Plato, and many metaphysicians in the East and in the West, held very elaborate and wonderful doctrines on the subject. But the Christian Churches have very wisely and justly kept silence about a matter on which neither Revealed nor Natural Religion offered them a shred of knowledge. Let us carry out their wise silence to its logical consequence.

Do we then live after death? Of course we do. *We* live. Our bodies dissolve, but our lives continue. What is *we*? And what is *to live*? If to live is to eat and drink, to feel joy and pain, to be conscious of action and of thought, we cannot affirm anything about a state which, so far as we can see, supposes the absence of a nervous system. For my part, I do not pretend to know what consciousness can be in the absence of a nervous system, for I mean by consciousness an organic state relative to

nervous system. And so far as *we* means this state of consciousness, I have no means of forming a rational opinion on the question.

Happily *we* are not nervous systems. Life is not an agitation of the nervous system. We act, we work, we teach, we inspire love, in places where we are not, where we have never been, and in souls which we have not seen in the body. We are not as the beasts that perish. And the social nature of man is not bestial. The soul of man has a subtle faculty of incorporating itself with the souls of our fellow-men. We are immortal by virtue of the intricate organism of which we are part. Nervous system, digestive apparatus, and locomotive organs are essential as a basis of life; but in due course that life can be practically continued by the agency of other bodies than those in which it begins. It cannot be continued, so far as we can see, without other like bodies, natures, and souls, such as ours, and therefore not in Dante's and Milton's Paradise. The organism, Man and Woman, is mortal truly; but the organism, Humanity, is immortal. We know of nothing that can destroy it within the conditions of our Solar sphere.

A good life in the flesh becomes thus incorporate with the mighty Organism, and becomes immortal with it. Not an act of ours, not a look, nor a thought, is utterly lost and wasted in space. For good or for evil it forms us, and our character, and our work. It forms some other brother or sister near us for good or for bad. If it be strong and noble, it shapes many. If it be weak and evil, it is gradually expunged. It may be not remembered, not recorded, and not distinguished. But it continues, eternally pulsating unknown through generations of Humanity. It may be a drop in the ocean of human life. But as surely as every drop which falls on an Alp will pass on ultimately into the ocean, so every human life, every act of life, every kind word, every good deed, every clear thought, lives in the life to come. We live, and we live for ever, the greatest and the feeblest. We do not continue to have nervous sensations; we do not eat and drink; we do not think or act, it may be, and we do not add to our work on earth. But *we live*. Our lives remain here and continue our work. The Humanity which nursed us as infants, trained us as children, and shaped our lives as men, prolongs that life in a collective eternity, when it has closed our eyes with reverent sorrow, and said in hope and love the last words over our bones. And it makes us as immortal as itself.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF SKEPTICISM.

By J. OWEN.

IN commencing the Lecture I have undertaken to deliver to you, I must start with definition: What is a Skeptic? The usual signification of the word is—"A man who disbelieves and denies what he ought to believe and affirm"; for I do not think it can be disputed that in its common acceptance the word has nearly always a connotation of blame attached to it. We find, however, that this meaning of the word, together with its imputation of blameworthiness, comes to us through a special channel. Like "infidel" and one or two other opprobrious terms, whose meaning has been fixed by the "*Odium Theologicum*," it bears stamped on its surface the impress which Theology thought fit to place upon it. Unlike, however, certain terms which were actually coined in that mint, the word Skepticism has an independent origin and history. It is, in fact, a philosophical term, and comes to us from that general store of philosophical thought and nomenclature to which our modern culture owes so much, viz., Greek Philosophy. The mental function for which it stands is as old as the first rudimentary exercise of the human reason. The word Skepticism is itself a pure Greek word; and it is to Greek thought that we must appeal to find the thing signified in its initiatory shape, its evolutionary growth, and full maturity.

Turning, then, to Greek Philosophy, we find that the word *σκέπτομαι* means, to see, to examine inquisitively, or with a desire of knowledge. Hence the *σκεπτικός* implies merely the thoughtful or reflective man, though, as reflection may imply hesitation, the notion of suspense is also included in its meanings. What is, however, of importance to notice, is, that the term in its first derivative sense has nothing to do with either affirmation or denial. It merely indicates a process which may lead to one or the other, without attempting to forecast the decisive result. A man who intently views a distant object may ultimately pronounce an affirmative or negative judgment respecting it, or he may remain in suspense; but this contingent result of his investigation is something apart from the method by which he arrives at it. The method is pure investigation; and this, and this alone, is the primary meaning of the term Skepticism.

But having fixed this original signification we may advance a step further, wherein we have the inestimable advantage of following in the track of Greek thinkers.

Living, as we do, in a world wherein ourselves and our thought are alike charged with impenetrable mysteries, in which our finite being is the

centre of more than one infinity, we find, as Greek Philosophy found long ages ago, 'that our investigation into truth is feeble and untrustworthy; that on speculative subjects, even those in which we have the deepest interest, it falls far short of demonstration, and therefore that in these subjects our only possible achievement is suspense, qualified, however, in some cases, by a greater or less degree of likelihood or approximate assurance, enough to warrant belief and even to justify action, but not enough to establish absolute certainty.

We thus arrive at the complete Greek definition of Skepticism which we find in the *Hypotyposes* of Sextos Empeirikos, the thinker who, more than any other, erected Greek Skepticism into a system. He terms it the equilibration or perpetual counterpoising of antagonistic ideas and arguments by means of which a man may arrive at suspense, and afterwards at Ataraxia, or complete mental serenity. Further analysis shows us that Greek Skepticism was characterized by these four qualities:—

1. It was a condition of search—a perpetual energy of investigation.
2. Its proper sphere was not the practical exigencies or duties of human life, but the speculative problems surrounding that life on every side.
3. Its outcome was truth, however much it might happen that its ultimate outcome was some measure of suspense.
4. It was resolutely opposed to dogma and finality on all issues wherein demonstrative proof was unattainable.

Here, then, we come to the reason of the animus with which theology has always regarded Skepticism.

Theology, together with every scheme of thought based upon authoritative claims, demands unquestioning belief. This is true of theology, even when the idea of an actual revelation remains more or less in the background. Truth being already communicated, further inquiry is regarded as superfluous, if not impious. Now, this unquestioning faith Skepticism refuses to yield. Nay, more, it denounces the demand for it as an insult. Regarding the human reason as a divine gift, and remembering also the fallible conditions, both in its origin and exercise, of human authority, even of the most unimpeachable kind, it refuses to renounce that primordial faculty of questioning and investigating by the exercise of which man is a reasoning being.

Now let us mark how theology,—understanding by that term that with which we are most conversant, the ecclesiasticism of Christianity,—has treated Skepticism. As we have seen, Skepticism claims the right of investigation. It does not imply nor necessarily lead up to denial. On the other hand, it holds aloof from dogmatic negation on undemonstrable subjects, just as it does from dogmatic affirmation. But theology, for its own selfish purposes, has misrepresented the skeptic attitude. It has confounded the wholly distinct positions of inquirer and negationist. In order to prejudice the character of the skeptic, it has made him what no genuine skeptic could be—a negative dogmatist, an absolute denier on

uncertain issues. It has taken from him his original and true character of inquirer, questioner, or reasoner.

This prejudice, born of theology, has, moreover, passed beyond its limits. It is found in every department of human thought in which dogmatism is assumed to be possible. Philosophers and scientists are nearly as apt as theologians to assume an attitude of infallibility on subjects inherently incapable of it. We cannot, therefore, in view of the interests of human speculation of every kind, lay too much stress on the fact that Skepticism proper has as little to do with absolute denial as with absolute affirmation. Theoretically, it stands at an equal distance from both extremes; practically, it may advance more or less in the direction of either. In any case it protests against the infallibility of negation as much as against the absolute certitude of affirmation. It refuses to accept dogma or finality whenever the conditions and circumstances are inherently undetermined and uncertain. To accuse a skeptic of denial, to make Skepticism synonymous with Atheism or any other form of negation, however much it may subserve the interests of an unscrupulous theology, is merely to confess a profound ignorance of what genuine Skepticism really is.

But why, it may be demanded, not unfairly, should theology have been permitted to pervert and misrepresent the true function of Skepticism? That it should endeavour to induce a condition of mind so favourable to its interests as unquestioning acceptance of dogma is not surprising; but why should it have succeeded, as it would seem it has done, in persuading the bulk of mankind that systems of dogmatic faith are more suited to the circumstances and needs of men than methods of inquiry and conclusions of a more or less suspensive character. The truth, I fear, is, that most men are by the very conditions of their knowledge-acquisition predisposed to dogma. They needlessly transfer to the region of speculation the coercion which pertains to the immediate evidence of their senses, or the needs of their practical life. Men are compelled to submit without question or argument to the undeniable witness, *e.g.*, of their eye-sight or hearing; they are obliged to act, to choose between different courses of action, whether they will or not, and this coercion seems to have generated a belief that a similar obligation attaches to their speculation, though a moment's consideration might suffice to show any reasonable being that such an inference is wholly illegitimate.

We must not, however, suppose that all men are alike in this particular. In harmony with Coleridge's well-known demarcation of all men into born Platonists or Aristotelians, we might divide most thinking men into born dogmatists or skeptics, or, adopting another distinction of the same purport, into synthetic and analytic thinkers. Limiting our observation to our own country, I fear it must be added, that the law of the nearly equal birth of the sexes does not obtain here—the proportion of born dogmatists to born skeptics is overwhelmingly great. Judging at least from the literature of

the subject, and comparing it with the similar literature of France and Germany, we might almost affirm that the characteristic of the average Englishman is dogmatic; that the John Bullism which dominates over his practical conclusions, his doggedness and obstinacy, his impatience of half-truths or merely probable conclusions, his dislike of ratiocination, when it does not terminate speedily in some practical issue, the idiosyncrasy, in short, which has excluded "not proven" from the scope of English legal verdicts, all tend to prove that his inborn tendencies are not favourable to inquiry for its own sake, or for the sake of purely speculative truth. At the same time I do not wish to impute to Englishmen more than a special share of a *vis inertiae* which seems common to men of every age and country. The inaptitude of mankind in general for independent truth-search is a complaint which we meet, *e.g.*, among the foremost thinkers of Greece; if we find it somewhat intensified by English thinkers, it may perhaps be attributed to the special causes to which I have adverted. Thus Locke, one of the noblest and most earnest of English truth-seekers, remarks:—

"The impartial lovers and searchers of truth are much fewer than one would wish or imagine"; while another English thinker, not so well known or so widely read as his admirable works deserve, Samuel Bailey, of Sheffield, re-echoes the same complaint in his "Essay on the Pursuit of Truth" (p. 62):—

"However unaccountable it may at first sight appear, it is a fact that few human beings in their moral, religious, and political inquiries are possessed with this simple desire of attaining truth. Their strongest wishes are directed to the discovery of new grounds for adhering to opinions already formed, and they are as deaf to arguments on the opposite side as they are alive to evidence in favour of their own views. The pure wish to arrive at truth is indeed as rare as the integrity which strictly observes the golden rule to act towards others as we would wish others to act towards us."

Skepticism being then the synonym of truth-search, and opposed in matters of speculation to Dogma, it is important to ascertain the specific grounds on which it appeals as a mental habit or method to the reason of thinking men.

These grounds are twofold, and using terms which, however objectionable to some Englishmen, seem almost imperative in any broad discussion of a philosophical subject:—they are: I. Objective, II. Subjective; inherent, *i.e.*, in the external circumstances wherein the truth-seeker is placed, or in the conditions of his own thought.

I. Every thinker who has attained a just sense of his position in the universe is aware that he is surrounded by infinities. He inhabits a point of universal space so infinitesimally minute as to be indescribable. His life at its longest is a moment of time which, in view of the twain eternities, past and future, is absolute nothingness. As a sentient being, he knows himself to be surrounded by myriads of other beings sentient and non-

sentient, of which his utmost research does not suffice even to tell the number, to say nothing of their origin, destiny, and significance. If further exploration seems to reveal traces of reasoned wisdom or definite purpose, these discoveries are met by others which appear to disclose mindless and aimless force. In a word, the thinker who directs all his powers on the world around, finds himself bewildered by the thousand-fold facts and issues which transcend his knowledge and mock his research.

Now, it is evident, that adopting the only possible definition of truth, *viz.*, an agreement between human knowledge and the facts of the universe, the grasp or possession of truth by the highest human intellect can only be partial and approximate. We may easily test this by asking, *e.g.*, What is the whole truth as to the origin of the earth, of our planetary system, or the stellar universe? What is the whole truth respecting the omnipresent multiform energy to which men give the name of Deity? In point of fact, truth, regarded as commensurate with infinity, becomes itself infinite; and man's utmost powers are as insufficient for its complete comprehension as the hollow of his hand to contain the ocean. But this admission of the imperfection of our conceptions of infinite truth must not be confounded with Agnosticism, especially with that indolent, dogmatic Agnosticism which is the despair of truth-search and the suicide of all intellectual vitality. Man has enough ascertainable truth to stimulate speculation and perpetual inquiry, without warranting definitive and dogmatic conclusions. He knows enough of the space that environs him to stimulate further research, without possessing enough to dogmatize, even with the aid of astronomical instruments, on the space far removed from his uttermost ken. He possesses some experience of time, since civilized man began to exist on the earth without having that complete knowledge of its contents in the past or future which would qualify him for dogmatizing on the one or the other. Similarly, he knows enough of the omnipotent all-pervading energy whose working he discovers on every side of him to warrant an inference on grounds of likelihood as to some of his qualities, without being able, on grounds of demonstration, to predicate the whole. Thus man's knowledge is for ever passing by imperceptible degrees from the partially known to the wholly unknown. Starting from the limited centre of his own personality and the elementary facts of his experience, it expands in circles that grow fainter as they widen, until it is lost in impenetrable mystery. Even the facts that come under our actual knowledge are but an index, petty and tantalizing, to others of unsurpassable magnitude and importance. Our knowledge of them has as little relation to the ultimate realities for which they stand, as an astronomical diagram in a school-book bears to the sublime objects it aspires to portray. It is not only the "flower in the crannied wall" of the Laureate, whose extremest possible research might suffice to reveal "what God is and what man is," but any other elementary fact of human knowledge, if pursued successfully to its utmost conceivable limits, might afford a clue to the great secrets of the universe. In short, the

inquirer into any kind of truth finds that his earliest footsteps tread on the confines of the impenetrable; that his plummet is continually lost in unfathomable abysses; that all his knowledge, no matter from what centre it proceeds, tends to become transcendental; that his science of numbers develops into a calculus of infinitesimals; that his physics in its further progress becomes metaphysics, and his natural science is sublimated and lost in supernaturalism.

As an example of this action of inquiring Skepticism on some well-known and admitted truth, we may take the case of gravitation. As far as our knowledge, real or presumptive, extends, this may be regarded as a universal law. It is a law which operates invariably in a predetermined manner, so that we can formulate its mode of working in a brief and simple rule; and yet, apart from the mere fact of its operating in a particular manner, we know nothing whatever of gravitation. Even its discoverer, Newton himself, was unable to conceive the *rationale* of its working. He could not imagine how the result was produced, except on the hypothesis that all space was filled with some material substance such as ether, and that the influence was transmitted from one atom to the next. But I need hardly remind you that, except as a working hypothesis needed to explain the transmission of light, radiant heat, electricity, and magnetism, etc., the theory of a space filled by ether is as yet wholly indemonstrable.

II. But if in every direction of human research the objective conditions of truth-attainment are difficult, its subjective requirements are no less arduous and hard to satisfy. Outside the puny limits of elementary consciousness and sensuous apprehension, the human mind has an unbounded appetite for knowledge, for research, for speculation. Though man's faculties are finite and limited, they are always ready to act as if they were infinite and unbounded. Take any simple truth or fact; let it have the testimony of the senses, the corroboration of long experience, the assurance derivable from the witness of others, still the inquirer is not satisfied; he would fain learn its origin in time or space. Suppose the truth to be of such a kind that even this desire is satisfied. In that case he would fain explore still further. He would learn the reason why the fact is such as it seems to be. Is its *rationale* inherent in the truth or fact, or has it been imported into it from extraneous sources? For such a determined inquirer it is not enough to learn, *e.g.*, the chemical constituents of air or water. He desires to learn the reason why air or water contains those particular elements, and in those particular quantities. At the point where his intellect stays its course, his imagination starts on her flight. You must please remember that I am not here describing an ordinary thinker, but the genuine Skeptic or truth-inquirer. It is no use to tell such a man that philosophy has nothing to do with final causes, or to brand those vestal virgins, as Bacon called them, with sterility. It is no use reminding him of the limits that hem in human experience on all sides. As a matter of theory he refuses to recognise these barriers, or, if he allows them, he limits

their restriction to his intellectual conclusions, and permits his imagination to pursue her course as though her flight were altogether unimpeded. The mental disposition here characterized—the keen sense of truth which refuses to be satisfied with ordinary limits and conclusions—has often been the subject of satirical and humorous remark. The following anecdote may serve to exemplify this skeptical spirit in antiquarian research—a field in which the zeal of inquiry is not so often qualified as it should be with skeptical suspense.

"An antiquary was engaged in carefully inspecting a large monument in a church. After he had copied the inscription, he turned to a bystander,—

"Do you happen to know, sir, anything of this family?"

"Nothing," was the reply, "but what we read here. You perhaps failed to observe the line below the original inscription."

"Eh? Ah! so I did. Thank you, sir"; and to the copy of the memorial were added the words, "The family is now extinct."

Still the copyist did not seem content. "Extinct!" he muttered, and then he paused.

Suddenly he advanced close to the tablet, examined it all over, stooped down and scrutinized the under edge, looked along the side edges, and then fetched the pew-opener's chair to stand upon while he peeped upon the dusty top and into the grimy mouths of the guardian angels. Finally he descended and retreated slowly, his eyes still fixed on the monument, and murmured as he paced mournfully out of church: "Well, I think they might as well have added the name of the stone-mason."

We might fear that not a little truth-search, after it has exhausted the object and its record, is expended on further details just as difficult of ascertainment as the maker of an obscure monument. We must, however, remember, that for such minds the object of inquiry is not so fascinating as the process.

I have little doubt that this mental character and attitude are more common than we are willing to allow. Goethe has more than once alluded to the pleasure which men experience in attacking insoluble questions. Speaking, *e.g.*, of the enigmatical character of the second part of Faust, he says: "It is precisely this obscurity that is attractive to men, and they labour upon it as they do on all insoluble questions." In a similar strain he says to Eckermann, "The summit of human attainment is astonishment; and if an ultimate phenomenon has astonished us, we ought to rest content. Nothing higher can be granted to us, and we ought not to seek anything beyond it. This is our limit. But generally the sight of an ultimate phenomenon does not satisfy, and we are like children who, after looking into a mirror, immediately reverse it to see what is on the other side." It would be easy to adduce the evidence of other thinkers on the same point, but the task seems needless, the characteristic is one which it is impossible for any close observer of mankind to overlook. With this consensus before us we might say, without indulging in irony or

satire, that our terrestrial surroundings are admirably adapted for that class of men whom we term inquirers or skeptics. Here, at all events, there is no lack of unsolved problems, no want of objects on which man may expend his insatiable curiosity, his unquenchable thirst for speculation. If the issue were raised, on the twofold basis of the nature of man's thought and the conditions under which he exercises it, as to whether the universe were designed for dogmatists or for skeptics, there could be no hesitation as to the answer. Without venturing far into the difficult region of teleology, we might at least plead that there is as much mutual fitness between a world of hard questions and a curiosity to explore them as between light and colours, and an eye formed for their perception. A universe of a different kind would indeed be hopelessly unfitted for the skeptic. A world, *e.g.*—if we can stretch our imaginations to its conception—in which there were no mysteries to be investigated, no enigmas to be solved, and in which all conceivable profundities were within the reach of well-directed energy, would be unsuited even for beings of ordinary human faculties and aspirations, as affording too little scope for the higher instincts of speculation and imagination. But minds of the former or genuinely skeptic kind are not rare in the world. Their preference of endless search for even the most absolute certitude may be the outcome of one of two causes. It may, as in Lessing's case, be the result of an overwhelming consciousness of the superhuman greatness of truth; or, as in the case of Montaigne,—who admitted that if restrictions existed for him in a distant part of the universe he would feel less happy on that account,—it may be the outcome of intellectual unrest, which is too vast, shall I say too infinite, to admit of being fully sated.

It will help to explain the existence of minds of these types, if we remember one characteristic of all matured independent thought, *i.e.*, its sense of unbounded speculative freedom. That thought is free is of course a truth which is only relieved from triteness by the fact that its significance is so generally under-estimated. In reality it signifies that in its own character and instinct thought is averse to limitation and finality; that there is in all subject-matters of speculation a *jenseits*, a beyond, into which it would fain explore; that the only limiting conditions are those which arise from its sense of imperfect attainment; that no *ab extra* boundaries are placed to its investigation. Conceive an astronomer, *e.g.*, investigating the stellar universe. Besides the limitation of his powers there is no impediment to his gaze. With finite instrumentality he is in fact looking into infinity. No matter how powerful his telescope, the conditions remain the same. There is no barrier or limit to thwart his gaze. If he could transfer himself from earth to one of the fixed stars, say, *e.g.*, Sirius, his relation to infinite space would probably remain unaltered. His starry horizon would be only removed some millions of miles farther, and he would be doing there what he does here, *viz.*, gazing with unrestricted freedom into infinity. Now this sense of absolute freedom with

which the astronomer pursues his investigation into the starry heavens is an illustration of precisely the same liberty which every genuine truth-seeker feels possessed of. So far as the object of his quest is concerned, he is absolutely free to direct his exploration in any and every direction. There is in nature and in the inherent instincts and tendencies of man's thought no dogmatic inhibition. There is nothing which says to man, "You must limit your investigation; you must give no scope to your speculation; you must restrain your truth-search within the narrow limits of the visible and palpable. Nature—and the same remark applies to Time, Space, and Existence—know nothing of external barriers deliberately erected to ward off human curiosity. Where such apparent obstacles exist, they are like the veil on the face of a coy beauty, half forbidding, half inviting the closer contemplation of the charms beneath. It is only man who transforms the subjective limits of his thought into actual barriers which he feigns to exist in the objects of his investigation.

* * * * *

Having thus discussed the nature of skeptical inquiry, I go on to consider—in harmony with the general purport of these lectures—the Relation of Skeptics and Skepticism to Religion.

There are three divisions under which I should like to consider this particular application of our subject. I. General Religion; II. Christianity; III. Protestantism.

I. By General Religion I mean that somewhat vague but profoundly implanted sense of the supernatural: that persuasion of the existence of some omnipotent Power which originated and directs all things, which is so widely diffused among mankind. It is obvious that, in reference to this most universal of all human beliefs, Skepticism has a justifiable if not a generally acknowledged function. It approaches the question in the genuine spirit of truth-search, without bias or partiality, with the persuasion that it is not one for hasty dogmatizing, but for honest and reverential inquiry. Hence it is prepared to make the outcome depend, not on an impossible demonstration, but upon a greater or less degree of likelihood. It does not regard a fair proportion of suspense or uncertainty as in any way derogatory to that supreme rule, or at all blameworthy on the part of those who bend their best energies to its investigation. On the contrary, it considers it as the attitude of caution, reverence, and humility, eminently befitting such infinite issues. Above all, it abstains from dogmatic negation; it will not dare deny wholly and absolutely any more than it will affirm definitely and exhaustively. It acknowledges, as it needs must, the unspeakable immensity and sublimity of the universe. It recognises in every direction, as far as human science can penetrate, the working of apparently universal laws. It acknowledges that those laws seem dominated by some such energizing principles as order, wisdom, reason, goodness, mutual adjustment; and it is prepared to gather all these indications into a supreme converging point, not of absolute demonstrable certainty,

but of reasonable probability ; not enough to warrant systematic and conclusive dogma, but sufficient to justify cautious and reverential consideration and worship.

II But the objection will be made : This reasoning may serve in the case of undefined Religion. But what have you to say of Revelation ? Is not Skepticism or inquiry in itself a denial and a distrust of Revelation ? To this I reply :—

1. That the extreme advocates of the claims of Revelation have generally dealt so ill with rational inquiry, by denying that it has any legitimate standpoint, or by maliciously confounding the attitude of inquiry or suspense with that of negation, that it would hardly be wonderful if Skepticism were to attempt reprisals. But,—

2. The answer I desire to insist on is, that Revelation, so far from rendering inquiry and verification needless, make their obligation all the more imperative ; for whatever theories we may form as to conceivable modes of direct Revelation, all the methods of such alleged communication with which we are conversant, imply human agency and intervention, and, what is of still more importance, lend themselves to human ambition and lust of power. Now, no experience of humanity or history is more abundantly justified than that which demands a scrutiny of every claim to dominate over the thought and conduct of mankind. I might go farther, and say that the progress of humanity to freedom and civilization has been attended by no feature more striking than the persistent scrutiny—often followed by the rejection—of such claims on the unquestioning belief and obedience of men. But the answer I have thus epitomized is one that has so often been made, that I think it more becoming to draw your attention to such replies than needlessly to add to them. One chief witness on the right of reasonable inquiry in this matter is a name which will always confer lustre on English thought. I mean that of John Locke. Both in his “*Essay on the Human Understanding*,” and in his “*Treatise on the Reasonableness of the Christian Religion*” he has touched the subject again and again, but always with the result of vindicating the right of reason and inquiry to scrutinize freely the claims of any and every revelation proffered to mankind. But among more modern writers who have dealt with this subject, the reasonings of Samuel Bailey, in his “*Essay on the Pursuit of Truth*,” are at once so explicit and conclusive that I must find room for a quotation (p. 24) :—

“Not less imperative reasons exist why we should diligently apply ourselves to the examination of the authenticity and import of any alleged communication from God to mankind, that wears the least semblance of credibility. To neglect inquiry under these circumstances would not only be a breach of the manifest duty arising out of the relation of a creature to his Creator, but it would be to plunge ourselves into those evils which an unacquaintance with accessible knowledge, and much more any positive errors on so momentous a subject would be sure to bring, as well as to sacri-

fice all those benefits that would necessarily flow from the possession of the truth. The disastrous consequences which have arisen to mankind from mistakes on this great question are alone sufficient to teach us the imperative obligation of entering upon the inquiry."

3. But there is a further reason why we should make Revelation,—understanding by that term its highest and noblest phase, *i.e.*, Christianity,—amenable to cautious and reverential inquiry.

In the beginning of Christianity the principle by which its truths were ostensibly apprehended was Faith, *i.e.*, moral persuasion, a Belief dependent upon feeling, upon spiritual sensibility and reasonable likelihood, and which was distinguished from the conviction of the senses or the intellect. Now this Faith, so far from arrogating to itself demonstrable certainty, deliberately disowned it, as a condition which implied its own destruction. It was that state of probation and uncertainty that harmonized with man's earthly life, and the inevitable conditions of that life. It was a principle not only distinct from, but in a certain sense opposed to, sight or knowledge. As Locke remarks in his first reply to Bishop Stillingfleet:—

"Faith stands by itself, and upon grounds of its own, nor can be removed from them and placed on those of Knowledge. Their grounds are so far from being the same, or having anything common, that when it is brought to certainty Faith is destroyed. It is Knowledge then, and Faith no longer. With what assurance soever of believing I assent to any article of Faith, so that I steadfastly venture my all upon it, it is still but believing. Bring it to a certainty, and it ceases to be Faith."

Such is Faith as it was defined by the Christian Apostles, and as it still exists in the thought of those rare thinkers who unite the spiritual insight with the intellectual discernment of Locke. For many centuries, however, *i.e.*, ever since the Christian Religion became transmuted into Ecclesiasticism, and its truths perverted into dogmas, this primitive and true sense of Faith has been lost. Faith now stands for absolute certainty. It implies a scheme of imperative, demonstrative beliefs—beliefs which are so far removed from the region of trust or hope, that they cannot even be inquired into without serious risk. You will observe that Ecclesiasticism has dealt with Faith in the same spirit of selfish obscurantism with which it has treated Skepticism. Just as it has made Skepticism, or honest inquiry, synonymous with Negation, so it has transformed Faith into Certainty—the motive in each case being the absolute inhibition of all free and independent inquiry. One of the most pressing wants of our time seems to me to be the dissociation of Faith from Dogma, and its restoration to its primitive signification. For this purpose nothing could be better adapted than the cultivation of a free and reasonable Skepticism. In its original and true sense of imperfect certitude, of devout trust, of persistent effort and aspiration, Faith, so far from being opposed to Skepticism, really implies it. It recognises the truth, that in a world so constituted as our own, and for men so formed as ourselves, Faith is the only kind of assurance that is possible.

It further admits, that for most of the doctrines of general Religion or special Christianity, the highest possible grounds are chiefly probabilities of a moral and spiritual kind. This, I may note in passing, was the basis on which Bishop Butler and Archbishop Whately placed the doctrine of Immortality, though the fact is mostly overlooked by those who regard the "Analogy" of the former as the text-book of Christian apologetics.

III. But there is one more religious aspect of Skepticism which I am desirous of bringing before you—I mean its relation to Protestantism. Schulze, in his celebrated work "*Aenesidemus*," in which he applied the principles of Skepticism with crushing effect to the dogmas of the Kantian school, calls Skepticism "the Protestantism of Philosophy." The appropriateness of the term is undeniable. The insurrection of Wiclif and Luther against Romanism was largely a protest against excessive dogma, the rebellion of the enlightened human reason against the infallibility and coercion of Ecclesiasticism. As you all know, the actual outcome of the Protestant Reformation was in a great measure to substitute one source of infallibility for another—Bibliolatry for 'Ecclesiolatry. You remember Lessing's apostrophe to Luther on this point: "O Luther, thou hast delivered us from the bondage of the Papacy; who will deliver us from the slavery of the *Letter*?"

But although the Protestant Reformation, starting as it did from a system of infallible Dogma, was not free from the hereditary taint of its parentage, its principles were so allied with freedom and with the right of skeptical inquiry, that they were not without efficacy, even when partially perverted. Thus Protestantism, by its very existence, proclaimed the duty of criticising whatever scheme of Dogma presented itself for human acceptance, no matter how ancient or presumably sacred its alleged sanctions; it demonstrated the danger and degradation of a blind submission to any external authority; it vindicated the right of reasoning men to employ their faculties without inhibition or restriction from any individual or community of their fellow-men. From this point of view every Protestant who realizes his true standpoint is of necessity a skeptical inquirer. His attitude to every system of belief is one, not of indiscriminate affirmation or denial, but of inquiry, careful, cautious, and continuous—the determination, according to the Apostolic precept, to prove all things, and to hold fast only that which is good.

* * * * *

You will observe that I have limited the scope of my Lecture to the religious aspects of Skepticism; but the conclusions I have laid before you are clearly applicable to every branch of human knowledge, to every science, e.g., capable of developing a tendency to dogmatism on matters beyond the reach of human verification. This really includes almost all our known sciences and schemes of philosophy. In all we discern the same fatal tendency to imperfect inductions and inconclusive proofs, the same disposition to rash and hasty generalizations, the same susceptibility of Dogma

petrification and of that ossification of living tissue which is just as hurtful to mental as to physical organisms, the same tendency either to suppress original and spontaneous thought, or to coerce it into submission to some traditional or generally accredited authority. In the name of intellectual and spiritual freedom, of the true autonomy of the individual reason and enlightenment which is the birthright of every man; in the name of that personal responsibility for his own creed which every genuine thinker must perforce admit, the Skeptic protests against assigning absoluteness, definiteness, and an infallible dogmatic sanction to whatever alleged truths lie beyond the test of man's verification or the scope of his understanding. Further, he pleads the persuasive, and sometimes even the coercive force of probabilities as the basis of human belief and action. He stipulates in the interests of truth that he shall not be required to overstate the grounds of his faith in any religious or, for that matter, in any scientific truth. If the true bases of any given belief are only probabilities, and from the nature of the case can be no more than probabilities, he pleads for their sanction on those grounds alone. He deems it both impolitic and dishonest to define as absolute certainties beyond the reach of doubt and inquiry what the Skeptical Reason, after investigation, must needs pronounce to be only likelihoods, or partial and approximate truths.

But what, it may be asked, would be the effects of a general diffusion of these principles of Skepticism,—1. Theoretically; 2. Practically?

2. Taking the second first, I must again remind you that Skepticism has nothing to do with the practical exigencies, or the self-attested demonstrations of life. Men, or at all events sane men, do not deliberate on the bare facts, *e.g.*, of black and white, or any other appeal to the healthy decision of the human senses. Doubtless there have been some in ancient as in modern times—men of the familiar dilettante type of those who “conquered Berkeley by a grin”—who have claimed to prove the futility of philosophical suspense by applying it to circumstances which necessitate immediate action. The ass of Buridanus, which starved between two bundles of hay while deliberating which was greater, was long held to be a legitimate *reductio ad absurdum* of suspensive Skepticism. In point of fact it was nothing of the kind. Indeed, the argument partakes of the proverbial character of the quadruped appropriately chosen to illustrate it. Students of Greek philosophy are well aware that the suspensive attitude, or even that of critical inquiry, was never conceived to apply to men's practical concerns when these were coercive and unquestionable.

1. Nor does there seem the least danger of any ill effect arising from the admission of the skeptical method even into our theoretical beliefs. Few men seem able to realize how much the ordinary beliefs, nay, even the resolutions and decisive acts of their lives, depend, not upon demonstrated certainties, but upon a greater or less amount of reasonable probabilities. Let us suppose, *e.g.*, a man endowed with thought and insight were to take stock of the whole sum of his beliefs from his most readily acquired opinion

to his profoundest conviction ; let us suppose him, in other words, to take his religious creed, his political and economic creed, his philosophical and scientific creed, and assign to each separate article its own persuasive or belief-coercing virtue, just that and no more. If he did so, he would undoubtedly be startled at finding how few articles in each case came under the standard of absolute demonstrable certitude, and how many, on the other hand, were based upon probabilities. If he investigated further, he might even find it impossible to distinguish between the demonstrated certitude and the problematical probability, regarded, *i.e.*, as a customary basis, whether for speculative conviction or for resolute and decisive action. This is, of course, but one method of proving the preponderating influence which likelihood has in our lives—the truth which Cardinal Newman expressed by saying, that “Probability is the Rule of Life,” or in the language of the apostle, “We walk by faith, not by sight.”

But it is time to sum up and conclude my Lecture.

I hope I have shown, beyond the possibility of misunderstanding, what genuine Skepticism is. Starting from its primary meaning in that perennial well-spring of our best speculation—Greek philosophy—I have pointed out its general significance in human thought, as well as its special relation to religion. Briefly described, it is the natural protest of the human mind against the tyranny of Dogma—against the combined despotism and narrowness of every scheme of human omniscience and self-arrogated authority. It is based on the instinct of mental and spiritual freedom, which is the most precious of all human blessings, and which no individual can forego without infinite danger to his mental and moral well-being. So far from being synonymous with Negation, whatever form Negation may take, whether indolent and dogmatic Agnosticism, or aggressive Atheism and Secularism, it protests against all alike. It emphasizes the truth, that the universe, with its myriad-sided aspects, its numberless complex processes and issues, its everlastingly varied and mutually interacting principles of Mental and Physical, Mundane and Spiritual, Real and Ideal, cannot be reduced to the petty dimensions of human infallibility, whether of a Church or an Individual. Hence we might define Skepticism as *THE RELIGION OF TRUTH*, as implying the attitude of cautious hesitation and reverential constraint before the infinite shrine wherein Truth has her dwelling. So far from being motivated by disdain of or indifference for Truth, it is actuated by the very opposite feeling, *viz.*, by a devout belief in her greatness, by a persuasion of her superhuman majesty and supremacy—the religious awe which prompted Lessing in the well-known hypothetical alternative, to choose Truth-search rather than Truth itself, as more suited to the cravings and perpetually energizing activities of the human intellect. It is further actuated by a persistent determination to abide by the laws and to state the claims and credentials of Truth with the sincerity and accuracy she herself demands.

Surely no task or effort—call it by what name you may—can be worthier

the attention of rational beings than this determination to investigate and, so far as possible, to attain Truth. The task has its religious sanction no less than its moral and intellectual significance and importance. Indeed, it is the concentration and unison of all man's noblest faculties and aspirations. "Believe me, my good friend," said Locke in a letter to Collins, "to love Truth for Truth's sake is the principal part of human perfection in this world, and the seed-plot of all other virtues." And if it should happen that with all our efforts we fail of attaining Truth—that our ultimate knowledge will always remain the partial product of our puny and circumscribed powers—even then we may take comfort in the reflection that energies so nobly and unselfishly directed have in themselves a great recompense of reward, besides harmonizing with the destiny of all creation, and sharing its groaning and travelling for the Infinite. As Lessing well observed: "It is not the Truth of which any one is, or assumes himself to be, possessed, that makes the worth of a man, but the upright endeavour he has made to arrive at Truth; for not by the possession, but by the investigation of Truth are the powers expanded wherein alone his ever-growing perfection consists." Nay, more: even if our Truth-search should not only fail of Truth, but should even lead us into error, we may still find consolation in the assurance which I will put before you in the oft-quoted words of John Hales, one of the many advocates of free and liberal inquiry of which the Church of England can boast. Writing to Archbishop Laud, he says: "The pursuit of Truth hath been my only care ever since I first understood the meaning of the word. For this I have forsaken all hopes, all friends, all desires which might bias me and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have spent my money, my means, my youth, my age, and all I have, that I might remove from myself that censure of Tertullian—*Suo vitio quis quid ignorat?* If with all this cost and pains my purchase is but error, I may safely say, to err has cost me more than it has many to find the Truth; and Truth itself shall give me this testimony at last, that if I have missed of her, it is not my fault, but my misfortune."

These two quotations, moreover, suggest one final remark: It is impossible to hear or read them without noting the philosophical equanimity, the calm self-reliance, the invincible consciousness of rectitude, the imperturbable tranquillity which both share alike, and which emanates from them like a deep undertone of music. Now the Greek Skeptics affirmed—it was a cardinal article in their belief—that the investigation of Truth induced that high philosophical attitude which they termed *Ataraxia*, *i.e.*, mental serenity, and this apart from any particular conclusion to which the inquiry might lead. These utterances surely tend to prove that a similar condition might be induced in ourselves by a persistent employment in the search and propagation of Truth of those reasoning powers which we may conceive were given us for that purpose. Whatever be our personal success or defeat, it is no small gain to feel assurance, that not only will the enterprise bring with it indirectly its own reward, but that in the proportion

that we can promote the cause of free inquiry, rouse men from the lethargy of Dogma, and impel them in the path of Truth-search, in the same proportion are we advancing the noblest culture and the highest interests of our fellow-men.

THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS BEARINGS OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY.

By MISS BEVINGTON.

IN trying to give an account of the great philosophical creed of our time one is tempted to write a volume. Its credentials seem to press for notice no less than its gist, and one would gladly offer evidence of its truth before describing the part it plays as creed and as code in the consciousness of its adherents. But in this book we are concerned less with the theoretical justification of our respective bodies of doctrine than with their presentation as they stand related to the moral and religious life of mankind. In the present chapter, therefore, the merest outline and the broadest general features of the evolution theory alone are given, the main effort being directed to making as clear as may be the precise way in which the holding of the theory naturally affects the will, the conduct, the conscience, and the religious sentiment of individuals.

Primarily the doctrine is not a religion. It is the least inaccurate account that can as yet be given of a general natural process. Scientific research arrived at its concrete evidences, scientific philosophy caught sight of its abstract significance, while engaged in the pursuit of natural, actual truth, "for truth's sake," and not for any other sake at all. But the vastness and the persistence of the uniformities that science brings to light do much to strengthen and deepen that "indefinite consciousness of existence transcending relations" which Herbert Spencer recognises as the "essence of religion." More than this is true. The theory of evolution brings with it implications which are calculated to affect religiously the emotions, and to affect morally the conduct of any one who has really grasped it, by giving him the most solemn and intimate sense of actual relationship with and participation in that supreme Energy of which the universe, within as without the mind of man, is the manifestation and the working aspect.

I. The process into whose regular workings evolutionists believe themselves to have obtained a glimpse, accurate even where not comprehensive, is nothing less sublime than that of the conversion of chaos—or featureless confusion—into form, order, life, thought, will, and all that lies on the hither side of these.

Even when, as in the hands of Herbert Spencer, the theory is comprehensively applied, and serves as key-note to a philosophy of the whole material, mechanical, mental, and moral universe, it still remains strictly scientific, since it is only this universe as knowable and thinkable—this universe, so far as our present powers can conceive it as built up out of observed natural factors—that is treated of.

As science, the first thing the doctrine appeals to is the hungry, truth-seeking part of the intellect, and the hardy, truth-loving corner of the conscience. The human mind at its best has already reached a stage of moral development when truth at all hazards is believed in as valuable, and its pursuit more and more encouraged by that "still, small voice" which makes so little of personal self-seeking. The moral doctrine inclosed within the theory is nothing other than the actual *law of life*—the law, that is, according to which life is developed and ennobled, its liberties secured, and its powers effectualized—as this law stands revealed in the open, but closely written book of natural fact.

The peculiar characteristic of the evolution doctrine is that it begins and ends at natural history. All that *is* is regarded as natural, and all that happens is regarded as resulting from the liberation of tendencies inherent in nature. It treats of the normal and constant workings of things everywhere and always among and upon one another. It discloses the part played by these constant workings in the origination, the development, the consummation, and the natural dissolution of this or that individual phenomenon. It notes the absolute constancy of relations, the invariable sequence in which changes occur. It points out how phenomena are everywhere and incessantly emerging *in one particular way* out of earlier phenomena, and as incessantly merging into yet others; and how all that is passes through phases without jolts or breaks,—no change anywhere or anyhow occurring without affecting a change also in whatever is in any sort of present relation to the incident agency.

The theory includes the natural history of morals, of conscience, of religious systems, and of the religious sentiment itself. The evolutionist preacher might take as his text the words, "This do, and thou shalt live"; but as a fact science is addicted rather to stating than to preaching. Yet it is this very fact, that a luminous and universally applicable code of righteousness has been come upon, so to speak, incidentally, growing naturally like a hardy wild flower right in the broad daylight and open highway of science *truly* so called, that gives to the evolution theory its special ethical significance at the present critical juncture of human affairs and of human speculation. Since it has been formulated, the actual meaning of conscience has loomed into sight. The natural history of that strange compunction which, within the individual, pleads independently of the individual in behalf of something more permanent than himself is spelt out between the lines of the natural history of Society—Society being an aggregate of interdependent individuals, each more or less at the mercy of all, all more or less at the mercy of each.

II. So much for a general indication of the gist of our doctrine. Now for an outline of the chief constituent *dicta* of the theory itself.

Inherent in everything and manifested in everything is an energy or cause, which, however, eludes scientific analysis, and remains in its entirety and its absolute nature for ever beyond the reach of thought and imagina-

tion. Its effects are perceptible to us under the aspect of nature and natural law. So far as these effects can be observed they are characterized by complete essential uniformity. Like conditions always and everywhere issue in like result. Hence the belief that the underlying and all-pervading force is single and identical. It is also conceived as unlimited in time and space, and as absolutely *persistent* and *inexhaustible*: "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

Meanwhile the ultimate nature of the primal Energy eludes comprehension, because that which underlies, is antecedent to, and includes the very *conditions* of sense, thought, and knowledge eludes any possible or conceivable extension of these powers *as such*. That Power in which we "live, move, and have our being" is real, but is not "by searching" to be "found out." It remains unknown and unknowable.

III. The evolution story begins at the knowable. Inherent in every part or point of the known universe there appear to be two antagonist tendencies. Each ultimate unit of existence, whether we call it for convenience an "atom of matter" or a "centre of force," tends persistently to "gravitate," that is, to approach, combine with, and settle in with the rest of things; and yet it tends no less persistently to keep aloof. Even when and while in close combination, it still tends to release itself, as itself. Any aggregate of any kind is therefore, by force of these contrary tendencies in its contained units, constantly tending to pull together, and as constantly tending to go to pieces. If the former tendency is the stronger, the aggregate keeps together, consolidates, concentrates, and loses its superfluous motion; it gets less fidgety and loose, more and more busy and connected, adjusts its parts within itself, adapts itself to whatever it has to do with in its external environment,—in a word, ORGANIZES, and begins to act as a whole made up of parts having a common interest. This whole, once formed, develops more powers (and more *various* powers) of affecting its environment, and of effecting that which its own sustentation requires. If this process continue long enough unhindered, the aggregate goes on to what may be called its completion, consummation, or perfection. That is, it reaches a stage where its needs and proclivities are exactly balanced by external occasion; its function is entirely fulfilled. No further advance is possible, its harmony with the conditioning environment being at length perfectly established.

Evolution is the name given to the process by which the formative tendency takes effect. The opposite process, representing the antagonistic tendency, is called Dissolution.

IV. The transformation of chaos into cosmos is an "eternal" process; that is, it tends *at every instant* to go on *everywhere*, so far as not thwarted by dissolution. Its order is always alike. It can at every point be analysed into a definite mode of behaviour on the part of the "raw material" of the particular phenomenon under observation, which responds *everywhere*, and always in the same manner on the same provocation. The uniform

persistent energy, or *principle of occurrence*, is manifested through all orders of phenomena, the mental, moral and spiritual no less than the so called material and mechanical departments of nature. The *least resisted* action of the evolving form of energy at any point whatever through the striving cosmos results constantly and instantly in the formation of a definite something,—a something possessing a greater or less degree of coherent persistence *as itself*—as a centre of influence affecting the formation and development of things subordinately related to it.

V. We are able with more or less precision to detect the process of evolution going on in its very various stages simultaneously. Here we seem to detect it in its crudest stage, where *matter in motion* or *motion in-matter* goes swirling about nebulously in the way that is believed to eventuate in the formation of suns and systems of worlds, and all that come of these. Removing our glance, we find the identical principle again working, where a vague sensibility in some low order of animal is tending to concentrate itself into eyes and sight, ears and hearing, and all that comes of these. Again, a number of living beings—ants, bees, or men—are finding circumstance too strong for them severally, and are banding together to lighten one another's burdens, aid one another's endeavours, pull with one another, and for dear life's sake in each individual, to live agreeably to one another; and so are coalescing into a compact *society*, and all that comes of this. Again, a loose collection of facts and experiences in the brain of some thinker is tending to become coherent, and to take the shape of a definite and lucid theory, and all that comes of it.

All through space and time, all through the whole field of matter, motion, mind, and morals, this tendency to take on shape and being, and to become definite, effectual, and independent, is eternally going on. There is always the initial vagueness and blundering, the loose consistency, the waste of material and of motion. Then, if the progress be undisturbed, an increasing *concentration of essentials* and *dissipation of non-essentials* takes place, accompanied by better and better internal adaptation of structure to the work required, and better and better adjustment to the external conditions. It is the same whether we regard the sentient and intelligent forms of existence, or the works of their hands, or the modes of their association. The more excellent the steam-engine, the less clumsy and the more finely complicated is its structure, the less its noise and bustle, and the less its waste of fuel and steam in proportion to the work done. The finished artist, while producing a drawing precisely and beautifully essential to his ideal intention, has, by rightly directed efforts, got into habits of eye and of manipulation which make him able to fulfil his design without the false or superfluous strokes of the pencil which hinder the full effect in mere students' work, or the constant use of the eraser necessary to the achievement by raw beginners of still more inadequate representation. The higher a governmental ideal, the better is the opportunity afforded to the harmless activities of the

ruled citizens, the more adequate is their protection from antagonist influences at home and abroad, the fewer and the slighter are the restrictions on the liberty of citizens, while the legal code becomes more discriminate and more minutely adaptable to single cases. The more elevated a religious cult becomes, the less its need of pompous and irrelevant accessories in proportion to the strength of appeal it makes to the devout sensibilities of the worshippers. The better the man—the more perfect the moral character—the less is the need of side-inducements to beneficent conduct, the prompter and stronger are the conscientious decisions, and the fewer the injurious errors made in aiming at the due welfare of others or in claiming the due rights of self or party.

This then is the picture nature presents us everywhere of an evolving individual thing, as of the evolving universe as a whole. Featureless raw material settling into definite form; vague and simple motion becoming determinate and complex; dim sentience tending to intelligence and will; crudities of every kind in every department of social life giving place to well-adjusted, clearly defined arrangement; instinctive moral proclivities growing discriminate and appropriate: everywhere and persistently, however, thwarted and resisted by an antagonist tendency, inherent in the component parts, to reverse and undo and to make of none effect all that has been painfully, slowly, and at great cost secured along the narrow line that "leadeth unto life." The whole creation, in very deed, has long groaned and travailed in pain, before the glorious liberty of a chosen few, inheritors of "kingdom"—*i.e.* of power, right, light, and freedom—rewards the sacrifice. This is scientific fact, not merely dogmatic formula. The evolution doctrine does not "destroy the letter," but everywhere, so far as any "letter" happens fitly to express, and in permanently fit terms, the gist of a permanent natural truth, it fulfils or affords aid to the fulfilment of that fit letter. Along the line of natural force when working evolutionally lie amelioration and adjustment, the reduction of evil and harm and miscarriage at any point to a minimum, the adequate employment of resource for the next step forward, and so, the advance towards a consummation which, as a whole and at every conscious point, justifies all the time and all the travail that have been expended in arriving at it.

The moral question is: "Shall we, or shall we not, fall in with this process? shall we strive to understand Nature's infallible way of ordering, of vivifying, of ennobling, and finally of *liberating* her own material? Or, shall we go on refusing to learn, hugging our foregone conclusions, and prolonging the struggle—so wasting and weakening those very powers, mental, emotional, and volitional, which by the slow process of evolution have been so painfully won for us and committed to our trust to carry further? shall we yield up these powers (which are thus *not* solely "our own," but "bought with a price"), in the cause of opposition, retardation, or even reversal of the beneficent process to which we owe them? "Sin"—immorality—for the evolutionist consists in the voluntary hin-

drance of or resistance to the universal law of amelioration. And the wage of sin is "death," not by any arbitrary fiat whatever, but because death is the actual, natural outcome of sin so viewed.

VI. Although the end is better than the beginning, and though the ultimate outcome of evolution is the lessening of evils and the increase of welfare for survivors, still the process is characterized throughout by an awful severity. True, it is the very inexorableness with which all that is insufficiently adapted to the exigencies of existence is "improved away," which eventually secures the supremacy and further development of the higher forms of life. True, that so there emerge on the scene, at last, intelligent beings able to look before and after; and moral beings, possessing compassions and compunctions, and able increasingly to soften the asperities of the cosmical struggle. But meanwhile, the irretrievable loss and defeat of the less adapted, by which the forward march of surviving races has been achieved, is terrific. The stern lesson must not be flinched that there is in the universal economy no respect of persons; that rain falls alike on the evil and on the good; that falling towers crush, and lava-torrents smother—not men rated by their fellows as specially sinners, but those whose carelessness or ignorance leaves them within the dangerous area. All who do not turn away will likewise perish. The severity of the lesson becomes even more suggestive when we note that this identical law prevails also in the moral life—not "ideal" morals, but fit morals being ever the surviving type. The severity of the lesson becomes even more suggestive, when we note that this identical law prevails also in the moral life—not "ideal morals," but fit morals being ever the surviving type. Nature recognises in the individual but one virtue: obedience, conscious, or unconscious—voluntary or involuntary—to the immediate demands of the law of life. She punishes in the individual but one vice: breach of the law of life. Error is never specially excused as unintentional. Helplessness (for the whole truth must be spoken) is never specially shielded. That race is helped which helps itself. Those escape whom a self-helpful ancestry has provided with a constitutional panoply. Whether an error be ignorant, or wilful, makes no difference to the immediate result of that error. Reward and penalty, as dealt by pre-human nature, are always "in kind."

Everywhere, the different existences in different stages of the process are meeting one another and fighting it out from their several achieved standpoints; and sometimes the less advanced is in stronger force than the more advanced, and the contest results in the discomfiture and dissolution of the better evolved, which is then once more reduced to "raw material" or dragged back to the simpler but less efficient point of vantage occupied by the conqueror.

This event, wherever it occurs, constitutes the pathos,—the "evil" of the universe. But the greater the degree of intelligent and moral—in a word, of human—evolution that is reached, the greater is the power of

avoiding such evil. Shall we not become as little children, and learn what is the actual law by which to ward off *catastrophe*, on one hand, and *degeneration*, on the other, that so we may do something towards consummating the total endeavour? Catastrophe, however, occurs most frequently at very early stages of the general advance; for instance, while the upheavals and submergences, the heats and frosts, floods and earthquakes, to which a comparatively young planet is liable sweep into painful, violent, and ineffectual death whole races of lowly animals. (It is said that the contorted attitudes in which whole generations of fishes are found fossilized in rocks evidences that these creatures, already possessing nervous systems, died *in agony*.) As the planet itself evolves,—that is, cools and settles,—it becomes better fitted for life, it exhibits less bluster of elemental forces, more and more firmness of surface, greater and greater precision of seasons; and so living forms get not only more and more opportunity of appearing (for they appear to be incidental to a comparatively very limited range of temperature), but are less and less hindered in the slow, hereditary work of developing into distinct races.

VII. The same contest reappears when, having arrived, several races find themselves competitors for the means of subsistence. So within the limits of an identical race, when the individuals find themselves competitors for mates. In each living creature the eternal Energy has effected a centre and starting-point for further exertion along the lifeward line; and the loftier and fitter the creature, the better is the channel grooved through its own proclivities for further progress. Life once possessed does not readily "let go"; and then there arises the already proverbial and generally recognised "struggle for existence" between life and life, species and species. In each case alike the successfully equipped competitor in the strife *survives* to leave a posterity; and so far as his strength, agility, or cunning become ingrain and organic does he, by the (still only dimly understood) law of heredity, hand on to his posterity the tendency to repeat the action which has been ancestrally successful, by dint of handing on the *organised innate aptitudes*—the natural habits or "functions" of a "structure" which, originally forced on the ancestor by the necessity of hard experience, is then finally inherited by the posterity ready-made.

Of course it is only very slowly that the active experiences of a living creature get thus consolidated into habit, whether martial, or wary, or defensive; and it is only so fast as habit becomes second nature, and considerably modifies nervous structure, that it becomes hereditary and instinctive. The very tissues of the living organism have to get into the required habit before this is the case. Nervous structure appears to be almost infinitely modifiable; it can be, so to speak, hardened and inured where useless but unavoidable friction is persistently repeated. It may be quickened, and rendered more and more sensitive and prepared for response to circumstance, in a thousand ways. And everything goes

increasingly to show that the mental, emotional, moral, and spiritual life of organized beings is bound up with and related to their nervous life as closely as the convex of a mathematical curve is related to the concave of the same curve.

VIII. The hereditary habits or instincts of the intellectual and moral life of man are set up in the same way and by the persistent working of the same essential principle of experience as are the hereditary habits or instincts of the physical life. Each instinct tends to establish itself firmly in proportion as it is of use to the organism in the exercise of its vital functions. It then gets spontaneously and constantly exercised; and exercise strengthens it and develops it further. In the moral sphere this amounts to the formation of character. If the organism, however, be so situated that its inherited instincts get in its way, are of no use to it further, or bring about more antagonism from its competitors than increase to its own resources—then does the instinct, though never so firmly rooted, *tend* to lose strength and persistence; and if its exercise be continuously disadvantageous to the general comfort or convenience of its possessor the structure in which the propensity sits loses its definiteness; the habit is "got out of," the instinct lost, and this re-modification, if repeated long enough in the experience of successive generations of individuals, becomes in its turn hereditary. In this way man first learnt to be a fine fighting creature, and then as conditions of welfare changed, had to begin unlearning it.

Now when we consider that all this is exactly as true of moral characteristics, intellectual proclivities, spiritual cravings, and æsthetic aptitudes as it is of the physical instincts themselves, an enormous significance is given to such evolutionary expressions as the "survival of the fittest," or to the stern and equally scientific truth, that "to him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath *not* shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have." Fitness to meet the emergencies of life is the one thing that nature demands in every organism which is to survive, to perfect what powers it has, and to develop new and higher orders of power. The longer any species, or any individual, remains master of the situation, the better fitted does it become to that precise situation. It wastes less and less resource; its action becomes ever neater and apter; its control of its environment becomes easier; it blunders less and less, and turns experience ever better and better to its own account. If, however, while still in a crude condition, it remains undisturbed long enough, it will get *so* "fit" and *so* comfortable and *so* masterful, that it will settle together into itself, lose its internal flexibility and elasticity more and more, and sink into that final equilibrium which precludes any further power of advance. It will, so to speak, fossilize. But in a world where so many orders of living beings are competing for like benefits, there is little opportunity for this "gaining of the whole world," which, in a very real sense, and wherever it occurs, does indeed involve the loss of the gainer's

"soul." The actual lapse of those activities in which intelligent moral and spiritual vitality consists, and on which the continuity of character and the possibility of ennoblement depend, is, as a fact, bound up with over-much prosperity as a normal consequence. The "soul" (or character), like the body, must keep on working in order to live; and when it has no longer to contend for survival, it tends to degenerate, and, as "soul," to disappear. This paradoxical fact goes far to justify, even from a teleological point of view, the grim universal law of struggle, and the continued atmosphere of opposition with which whatever is noblest is constantly surrounded. "God," *versus* "mammon": integrity, *versus* comfort: effort, *versus* repose; the "soul," *versus* the "world":—such is the choice eternally presented; and the utmost that science justifies us in desiring, is a condition in which the necessary lifeward effort of higher beings shall have come to be so far instinctive as to be itself a source of pleasure to those who have to make it; while, through the increasing accuracy of its direction, and oppositeness of its method, it entails ever less and less harassment and distress to such lowlier claimants on life as stand in its way.

IX. Evolution then is the *law of lifewardness* as evidenced throughout nature. I use the clumsy word "lifewardness" rather than "life" for two reasons. First, because the evolution of a world, as such, is already "in full swing" and some way advanced before any phenomena appear to which the word "life" is applicable. To the second reason for using the word I will return later. Meanwhile, the theory regards life as *on the way* wherever a world is cooling, wherever motion in masses of matter is externally lessening, and internally breaking up into complex vibrations; wherever a quivering tissue is responding more and more minutely to changes in the environment.

The life of any organism consists in its power of *carrying on the process of self-adjustment*. Herbert Spencer calls life "a moving equilibrium." Inside itself no aggregate is ever at rest; as it is at one instant it quite certainly will *not* be the next instant; and unless something happen to balance and compensate a change in one part of it, it will *tend* to go to pieces. But life is an ancestrally acquired tendency in the component parts of any living whole to respond in just such a way to any disturbing influence as to make good whatever loss occurs, to dismiss whatever is injurious or burdensome, and, in a word, to readjust continually, and even to derive benefit from changes in its environment.

The decay of this self-adjusting power involves an increase in the tendency to dissolution. There is no neutral ground; and there is no stability in a quiescently neutral or exactly balanced condition. What is not an active carrying-on of life is a slide towards death. Death is the total cessation of the adaptative and re-adjusting power on part of the organism to the conditions at work around and within it. This is as true of a man as of a fungus, and as true of a nation as of a man.

X. Exactly in so far as the lifeward principle in all things be identified

with "good" must the deathward principle be identified with "evil." And since no other measure of good is traceable throughout the natural history of religious, social, or philosophical moral creed than life in some form or other, so does it appear that, in coming upon the truth concerning the actual normal laws of all life, we disclose incidentally the actual normal law of moral life and of duty.

This needs explanation. And, first, it brings me to my second reason for choosing the word "lifewardness" as the watchword of ethics rather than the word "life." All life is evolved on one principle and in one manner. But all life is not conducive to the general evolution of the highest life, that is, to the development of individuals possessing those functions and faculties whose normal tendency is to yield a maximum of well-being all round with a minimum everywhere of pain, mistake, and hurtful reaction.

Each form of life may be said to have an intrinsic right to fulfil the law of its own being, however narrow the limits of that being, and, having done so, to depart in peace. But there is, in very deed, *high* life and *low* life; i.e. life which, in the mere process of fulfilling its own bent, carries the beneficent, joy-enhancing, pain-removing cosmical process on farther and quicker; and life which, while in itself reaching no high or fine degree of awareness,—no definite faculty, on the one hand, nor adequate aim, on the other,—does also, in pursuit of its own less-alive claims, obstruct, baffle, and distress the normal progress of such forms of life as more completely and less wastefully bring about some long-delayed consummation which dignifies with meanings and appropriate result the cosmical struggle.

Happiness is the result of complete correspondence between constitution and occasion, between need and resource, between faculty and opportunity, between claim and recognition. In a word, it implies *adaptation*,—a fit adjustment between the living organism and the conditions of its life—and is so far intrinsically good wherever it occurs. But then comes in the rivalry between that which is only intrinsically fit, and that which is fit both in itself and in its relation to other fit things. Regard must therefore be had as to the kind of happiness sought and recommended; that is, to the sort of life to which any special form of happiness is appropriate. A contented condition of *life in particular* is not always conducive to *lifewardness in general*. There are low orders of living beings, the carrying on of whose own normal and vital functions entails distress and defeat to high orders. I need only indicate such living forms as fever-germs, tubercle bacilli, cancer-growths; as parasites, vermin, and deadly serpents; as locust armies and caterpillar plagues (such as that now working havoc in the forests of South Germany); further, in the social sphere as human banditti, swindling firms, anti-social derivors of lucre through the supply of adulterated foods, deleterious quackeries, desocializing literature, arts, and opportunities; or whose success involves discouragement and hindrance

to other and better-fitted forms of human nature. Against such the struggle continues, and must continue.

The reason why the advantage of highest life rather than the promotion of life in general is made a criterion of true progress is because the value of life lies largely in its *freedom from misery* and in its *freedom to operate*. And the more keenly sensitive and appreciative living individuals are, the better servants are they of the whole in both the above particulars; and obviously these better servants are best secured and encouraged by all that subserves that part of their nature which binds up their interests with that of the rest. Hurtful forms of life must be defeated, if only for the sake of leaving the field clear for beneficent impulses in life. The socialized being has the widest field of individual feeling,—is more *alive* than any less advanced type. His cosmical "rights" therefore come first. Development always presents like features, and whatever is not hindered goes on developing, and this in disregard of all extrinsic valuations whatever.

Not all life, then, is to prevail. Abstract ethic is, strictly speaking, the *adjustment, by means of human conduct, of the universal biological law to the requirements of the most highly evolved*, and to such creatures, human and sub-human, as can *exist together with mutual advantage*. In the supersession of lower kinds is the general lifeward law subserved.

The highest human beings are the most, socialized; that is, those in whom that long-continued process of taming brought to bear on original barbarism (which operates by means of public opinion, penalty, and reward, and which is known as "civilization"), has evoked sensibilities which have the claims and the welfare of fellow-creatures for their natural object, and which, left to themselves, dispose the individual to behave in a manner consistent with the liberty and the well-being of those fellow-creatures. The best men and women are, in short, those whose welfare includes and implies the best chance of welfare for all the rest.

XI. Cosmical emotion has been called "a substitute for religion." It is no mere substitute: it is a more advanced form of the identical religious sentiment which inspired all the theologies, from fetichism to the most attenuated form of theism; a sentiment which has striven to give account of itself in system after system of transcendental dogma, and to express itself in the visions of one seer after another in all ages. This expression has varied with time and place; but its gist has always been identical. Whether it be Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, Paul, Emerson, or Spencer who speaks, the sentiment remains the same; a sense of one-ness (or *at-oneness*) with the incomprehensible and eternal power by which all things consist and persist, with the power which yields life and the law of life; and, further, a sense of submission to that power, of sympathy with its drift, and acquiescence in its law. Are we tempted to cavil at the apparently ruthless way in which all merit save that of present fitness is disregarded in the selection here of the victims, there of the survivors of disaster? We must remember that it is precisely by dint of thus keeping impartially to the case in hand that the

fortuitous flow of cause and effect has, in very fact, slowly yielded all the wonders of the living, conscious, and moral universe. Last of all arrives, as its result, that life whose *voluntary momentum* is actually along the very line in which this sternly-beneficent process eternally moves; that is, the life of conscious and perfect freedom; the life that works acquiescently, accurately, and joyfully with, and through, and by means of the cosinical or life-creating Agency. And this is *the religious life itself*. As to the cruel cost of the ill-adapted by the way, and the slowness by which result is achieved and the creature's intelligence, will, and free conduct at length shaped and won for the creative cause,—the evolutionist must sigh like the rest. But he sees in the inherent difficulty and awful painfulness of the effort by which life is slowly ennobled and liberty slowly secured, cause rather for wistful sympathy with the inscrutable Agency whose "effort is so displayed; and he values the more sacredly all beautiful and excellent things that have been thus won "as by fire." His sympathy will impel him to pull with the eternal power so fast as he learns better to understand its drift, direction and method; and so to do one human Will's utmost to diminish the cost of future amelioration.

All evolutionists are not religious; the cynic can argue glibly enough from cosmical facts evolutionally considered, and no evolutionist can logically trip him up. But then neither could a Muhammadan nor a Christian. The proneness to religious feeling either exists, or does not exist, in individuals; but the subject-matter of religion, being for ever precisely something which lies beyond the realm of definition, can, of course, never be demonstrated. "Wherefore," says the ultramontane, "let us *dogmatize*; for without religious dogma how are we to justify and support conscience and moral principle?" The evolutionist replies: "Fortunately for truthfulness and consistency, the scientific study of morality reveals it as *not* dependent on the fluctuations of the religious sentiment. The two are of distinct origin, and in their nature and function are largely independent of one another. True, advanced moralists, arising in periods and places characterized by a high degree of civilization, have enforced "morality," or duty to man, as the highest form of "piety," or deference to God. True, that such teachers have repeatedly and instinctively so blended the worship of the Creator with mercy and justice toward the creature as to give to each injunction the force and authority of the other. But still, on the scientific view, duty would still remain duty were religious sentiment extinguished to-morrow and for ever. For morality in its ultimate expression means the promotion of welfare in the social state through the agency of the individuals living in that state. Theories respecting the origin of the universe, of life, or of mankind do not affect the actual conditions of the relation between a man and his fellows in the least; and so morals remain independent of religious opinion and belief. Morality consists in aid actually rendered to, or evil hindered for the whole race, *through the conduct of individuals, but without regard to persons.*

XII. Theologians have represented conscience as the voice of God speaking super-reasonably in the heart of man. The inward monitor so regarded has, however, too often refused to be educated, and crude old canons of duty have been blindly clung to as piously admissible and socially sufficient long after social advance has shown them to be no longer fit, fair, or edifying. Conscience gains more than it loses of permanent authoritativeness when regarded as the Supreme voice speaking reasonably for man, through men, and so as maintaining a constantly rising standard, adapted to the increasingly complex needs of a progressive race.

To adapt conduct to the normal claims and ultimate advantage of human beings all round, and on terms equitable to self, neighbour, contemporary, and posterity, is, in short, the problem which conscience "truly so called" has at every moral juncture to solve. Whether individual indulgence be, socially regarded, right or wrong, fair or unfair whether individual sacrifice be, socially regarded, right or wrong, fair or unfair; this is ever the characteristic gist of every question which the true evolutionist puts to his inner man, whenever "Dame Nature" and social integrity *seem* to pull contrary ways. Where society and individual are both in a healthy (that is, in a normally-developing and actively self-adjusting condition), these never do, in reality, pull in opposite directions. Where they actually and irreconcilably conflict, one or the other is in a morbid or a backward condition; and then the moral problem is to discover which, without the slightest partiality for either being permitted to influence the ultimate judgment and the voluntary conduct flowing from it.

The discovery of the fact that human society is an organic entity, existing and developing on principles precisely similar to those evidenced in the life of single organisms; and the further discovery that the human conscience in individuals is related to the needs of the community in much the same way as the sensitiveness of the palate is related to the needs of the stomach, or the perception of beauty to the demands of the eye, these twin discoveries have come as firstfruits of the evolution theory, and indeed not a day too soon.

The distinctive characteristic of evolutionist ethic is, then, the insistence on the *development* of conscience and of codes. The *relativity* of morals is the new point. The only fixed thing about duty is its relation to the requirements of general human life as affected by the voluntary conduct of individuals. As the vital needs of the community change, so must the detailed demands of that community on individual concessions, efforts, and compunctions also change. Always, however, the moral man is the dignified citizen,—the individual who does no harm to and is useful to his contemporaries and his posterity.

The recognition of the natural relation of righteousness to human requirement is not new. It is as old as the days of Job. Said Elihu: "If thou sinnest, what dost thou unto Him? (God). If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him? . . . Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art, and

thy righteousness may profit the son of man" (the race). The universe can indeed right itself, whatever we do or fail to do. Not so our own soul, our fellow-creature, our race. The evolutionist teacher does *not* say, "Thou shalt abide throughout all generations by this or that temporarily fit rule of action"; but, "Thou shalt, even in thy breach or dismissal of the killing 'letter' of ancient or no longer fitted laws, honour and abide by the life-giving (lifeward) 'spirit' of all law." And the spirit of all lifeward law is this: Thou shalt *not* do harm; thou shalt not injure or destroy, oppress or restrict, defraud or betray thy race; thou shalt always and at every juncture do fairly by thyself, thy neighbour, thy posterity, or *anything else* which in its nature *does not injure these*; i.e., anything else which is not competing for dear life with these. Justice to harmless brutes is included in the ultimate code.

XIII. The evolutionist has not any strong hope to offer to the still numerous individuals who claim, each for himself, an indefinitely or endlessly prolonged conscious existence. This is a claim based, however little the claimant recognises its origin, on the present drawbacks and assumed unalterableness of terrestrial conditions. These drawbacks the evolutionist believes to be largely removable where they lie in the disposition of external things, and to be completely removable so far as they lie in the disposition of human nature. And he believes that as fast as the belief in a continued personal consciousness comes to be considered actually erroneous, and so fast as the cases of premature and painful dissolution of human lives are so reduced as to become exceptional, so fast will the very desire die out, in harmony with the law of disused function, which ultimately brings about the lapse of inappropriate instinct through atrophy of its concomitant nervous structure. In very many highly sensitive and highly moral natures the claim to and the desire for personal immortality is already totally extinct. Death has already lost its sting, and the grave its victory, in face of that view of the whole which imparts the sense of eternity to each moment as it passes, which floods with satisfying meaning every incident, and provides a mental consolation for and throughout any and every possible form or degree of personal agony, failure, or forsakenness, at any rate so long as such distress remains merely *subjective*, and so measurable by the limits of the affected consciousness, within which an evolutionally fitted Will reigns as master. All this is fact.

The evil of life is largely the result of human error and incomplete sociality. Pessimism is not encouraged by the natural history of society. On the other hand, it is a mistake to jump to the optimist's conclusion that all things are in train for inevitable improvement, and may therefore be let drift, as certain to come right in the end. There are twenty ways of going wrong for one way of going right. Nature, when thrown back, laboriously recapitulates old chapters in her tale of development, and meanwhile generations pass! There are no short cuts to perfection.

XIV. It is an awful truth that the reign of benevolence only began with

the reign of social man. In pre-human days, death, violence and wholesale catastrophe, accompanied with pain, overwhelmed whole races. And the struggle between such races as survived catastrophe was always accompanied by reckless cruelty, and unsoftened by compunction in the victors. As men, however, grow many (here, or there, or anywhere), they have to get on together; and the mutual punishing and rewarding, approving and despising of human beings by one another naturally occurs in proportion as each individual acts conformably with or antagonistically to the interests of the rest. But this recompense from outside, from the fellow-creatures his lot is bound up with, inevitably "educates"; that is, it sets up mental habits and characteristic emotional response in the individual who experiences it. Social feeling begins in the crude form of social fear and servility on part of those who are most at the mercy of the rest. Obedience is the earliest virtue. Later, inherited habit becomes second nature; the acts which are always approved and rewarded come to be willingly done. Their doing modifies the nervous structure in such way that at last they tend to repeat themselves as the natural function of that structure; and so serviceable impulses and kindly, honourable, and just conduct come to be the organic expressions of noble characters. This is the evolutionist's account of the origin of moral compunction. Conscience is the inward reflection of the social permission and prohibition; and sympathy, the spontaneous individual response to so much of the social needs and rights as lie within the field of the individual imagination. It is obvious that in a continuously developing community the precise forms of conduct, or types of character most useful to the welfare of that community must vary from age to age. Conformably with which fact the code of rules for conduct, and the ideals of what constitutes highest excellence in citizens, have also constantly varied, and in advancing communities have developed and grown constantly more discriminate. True, the average conscience comes up but slowly to any "improved" standard; that is, a standard demanding and recognising such fresh and finer forms of moral sensibility as shall be adjusted to the requirements of more delicately poised social conditions. Melioration in the department of morals takes place always and solely in the direction of *finer and fairer discrimination*, based on a higher degree of particular sympathy, and a higher conception of ideal welfare, always in harmony with the dictates of such sympathy. The man who is wretched till he sees an injustice redressed is more likely, if left untrammelled, to leave no stone unturned till at any less cost to himself it be redressed, than is a man whose individual sense of justice and whose sympathy is so little developed that he needs the dread of the "law," the support of a creed, or the spur of an example, before the evil *itself* can move him to effort or sacrifice. Character is the main thing. Character must be exercised, and initiative encouraged, in order to grow and to effect appropriately; and it is desirable to set free from all kinds of restraint as much initiative as exists in socialized individuals both for sake

of making these individuals happy and free, and for giving the community the benefit of their example, influence, and works.

* * * * *

In religion, the true evolutionist is *agnostic* rather than dogmatic, repudiating alike the dogmatism of the theist and the dogmatism of the atheist.

In philosophy, he is neither materialistic nor spiritualistic, but recognises the possibility of giving a consistent account of the known universe in the chosen terms of either school.

In ethic, he is neither pessimistic nor optimistic, but *melioristic*; that is, he finds himself by no means in "the best of all possible worlds," and yet also by no means in a world where evil is inveterate and incurable: rather, in a world where all is in flux, where forces are plastic and effort remunerative, and which correct knowledge, steadfast will, and sympathy enable humans indefinitely to improve.

In politics, the evolutionist is neither conservative nor revolutionary. At the present critical juncture of affairs all over the civilized world, when the pressing point of the struggle between two claimants for "survival" in right of "fitness" lies, politically, at the point where Socialism and Individualism join issue, the whole weight of the evolution theory falls naturally into the *individualist* scale.

That ideal society towards which general progress actually tends, and actually has ever been tending, is a society composed of *autonomous individuals*, each possessing, by virtue of a highly socialized character, a socially conceded "right" to freedom; each spontaneously, voluntarily, gladly, and yet incidentally promoting the welfare of the community as part and parcel of his own idea of his *own* welfare. This is a consummation already attained in the cases of single individuals, attained even long ago wherever society, by hook or crook, had, apart from scientific theory, "happened upon" that sufficient degree of development which yields as its fruits such type of character. The type is more frequent, less out of the common, in our present society than it ever was before; and the evolutionist pleads for its right to survival. It is a type of character as concerning which the "kingdom of heaven" lies "within." But it is a type only to be met with where *individual character* has reached a high degree of development. And the process of this development is carried on most quickly and most efficiently where as much scope as possible is afforded to individual activity. The reason it is more common now than it was in the days of Jesus is because institutions are freer, and allow more initiative to individuals. The reason why it is commoner among Anglo-Saxons than among, say, Russians or Chinamen, is again because there is less pressure exerted on the individual consciousness and conscience by the regulations of authority, acting indiscriminately and autocratically. Any form of government (even that called "collective") acts autocratically, and in its own name, as Government. Wherever and so long as there

is a dearth of individuals able to effect the final aims of just government quicker and more surely without than with publicly and externally imposed reward and penalty, government was and is still "fit." But the European evolutionist of to-day perceives that this dearth is constantly diminishing, and pleads for the entire liberation of as much humanness and of as much instinctive tendency to *go right* and to *maintain its own without governmental help, and on new and individual methods*, as exists. We have learnt pretty well how to act in order to "live"; it remains now to learn how to "let live." Character is the first social desideratum for the evolutionary moralist, and experience is the first condition of character-development. Due experience gained while in exercise of unopposed volition, while leading to no animosities, goes more home to the individual conscience, and is more likely to be further impressed and handed on through the agent's subsequent influence, than a hundred forced lessons.

To recapitulate. Evolution is, then, the law of lifewardness; *i.e.*, the law of that process by which worlds are fitted for life, and by which again life is developed, ennobled, and consummated.

The vital process, wherever in progress, shows itself as *adjustment of the organism* to the conditions in which its lot is cast.

Since everything, within as without the organism, is eternally in movement, such adjustment amounts to a "*moving equilibrium*." Directly this equilibrium ceases to be kept up, dissolution sets in; and the organism, *as such*, relapses into its elements. Everything therefore which is not keeping up with things is deteriorating.

Each organized thing has its appropriate "raw material." Mere matter-in-motion is the raw material of the solar system. Protoplasm is the raw material of living organisms. The raw material of human character is a chaos of unregulated brute sensibilities and propensities. The raw material of society is a loose aggregate of barbarians, whose interests are not yet mutually interdependent, and whose action is as yet uncombined. *One* mode of procedure organizes and vitalizes each of these.

The acceptance or rejection of the moral aspect of the evolution theory depends upon how much readiness there is in the mind of the morally disposed student to accept the actual constitution of things as a sufficient manifestation of that supreme Energy or Tendency upon which order, life, mind, and Will depend; and to see in the most ordinary and fortuitous facts of cosmical occurrence some hint or other concerning "the way, the truth, and the life." Any one who thinks that God and Nature are twain, and are at enmity, must of course choose between them. He is in the position of a child whose parents are in disagreement, and who has to decide between father and mother, with the certain prospect of disobeying and being punished by one or the other. Any one who regards himself as the child of a "fatherly God," all-knowing and benevolent, and also as the child of a "Dame Nature," all blind and stupid or desperately wicked, is of course in no position to welcome a doctrine which refers to natural

history for all its guidance. Meanwhile the evolutionist has reached a conception of things in which all appears consistent. For him the whole course of nature is *one*; and out of this natural course, and in spite of the stern and saddening facts witnessed to as incidental to that course, he believes that the ideas of "God," of "goodness," of "duty," and "conscience," have normally arisen. Each beautiful thing, no less than each blundering thing, has arrived naturally, and amounts, so far as it goes, to a warrant each time it arrives of a path rightly grooved and a momentum rightly directed.

The only way we can aid the cosmical endeavour is through the amelioration of human lot in our fellows and ourselves: ourselves with and through and in our fellows. For on our planet human history represents the vanguard of the eternal forces. We have to make our race the channel of "least resistance" through which the forward impulse can, with least hindrance and least liability to miscarriage, work, formatively and splendidly, toward that consummation which means the *fullest degree* of life, awareness, beauty, and will, with the *least degree* of pain, distress, and drawback of any kind.

But—the amelioration of human lot, whether "morally" (that is, for human creatures' own piteous sakes) or "religiously" (that is, for sake of awed and enthusiastic participation in the supreme cosmical Effort, sympathy with which constitutes the youngest and highest form of spiritual life), whether in the moral or religious count—amelioration of human lot can *only* be accomplished through amelioration of human character. As Herbert Spencer says, it is impossible to get "golden conduct" out of "leaden instincts." Golden instincts in human breasts would make of our planet a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness. Golden instincts depend, however, on character; and the amelioration of human character, though it has ever been going on, is a very slow process. There is no jumping to perfection. All reward comes to the accurate observer and courageous follower of eternal natural law; but as Jesus sadly said, "Strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth unto life," and (in proportion to those who miss it) those who find and follow it are still the very "few."

Meanwhile there remains the fact that there *is* a right and lifeward way; that it *is* findable, and that to pursue it is to reach, or to help reach, that which when reached is felt to be the consummate goal. The unhesitating onwardness of the natural casual process, the permanence of relations, the constant multiplication of effects, and the necessity of *clearing the way* for the developing whole, if one would not be crushed by it, remain serious facts. But it is at every instant and every juncture of events possible so to act as to make things in general better without making things in particular worse, and to make things in particular better without making things in general worse. This is *meliorism*. And meliorism is the moral principle which naturally and logically ensues on full comprehension and apprecia-

and vigour of a new social revelation, for which, however, the ages of Christian development have been preparing men's hearts and intellects. Not only is the idea clear and definite in itself, but when embodied in a society we have a social institution distinct from every other now existing. An Ethical Society, a fellowship solely in devotion to the good in the world, is wholly distinct from every Christian Church, whether Orthodox or Unitarian; for the Church, besides devotion to the spread of goodness in the world, demands allegiance to a personal Creator of the Universe. An Ethical Society, therefore, differs from every Christian Church in that its basis in the first place is clearer and simpler, is capable of being understood by the most ignorant man of ordinary intelligence, because all men know at least sufficiently well for practical judgment what goodness in human character is. But the idea of a personal Creator of the Universe has baffled the speculative efforts of the best disciplined and philosophic minds. In simplicity, therefore, an Ethical Society may claim precedence over any Christian Church, and from this it follows that an Ethical Society is in its very nature more suited to men of average intelligence and of busy life. But it also differs from Christian Churches in being broader in its fellowship. It excludes no one because of scepticism as to the existence and personality of God or the divinity of Christ. But, on the other hand, let it be distinctly known that we are not, as a society, Agnostic. We do not deny the possibility of knowing the existence of God. We do not request or exact that a man shall first give up his belief in a personal God and immortality before he shall become a member of our societies. We simply ask that he have a direct desire to plant good conduct and root out evil. As a society we are not pledged to any theory as to the origin of the universe, or of conscience itself, nor to any theory as to the limits of human knowledge. We are not an Agnostic Society; we have no theory at all, as a society, concerning the limits of knowledge, therefore the charge which has been made against us that we are Agnostic is due to a

it is the bond of human fellowship and brotherhood. We demand that no one shall make the ideas of God and immortality the bond of religious union, that no one shall place any moral blame or stigma upon any other man for not holding them.

But although thus different from all Christian Churches, it does not follow that we approach any nearer to non-Christian religious fellowships, which have recently sprung up, than we do to the Christian Churches. We are quite as distinct from Positivism, Secularism, and Socialism.

The Positivists set up the worship of Humanity, adoration of the great and good men of the past regarded as constituting an organic being, as the bond of religious fellowship. We do not condemn in itself the adoration of Humanity so long as it be not made the bond of fellowship; but when set up as the foundation of a new Church we count it as unjust and unwise. It is unjust to every man who cannot naturally cast his motives for doing good chiefly into a sense of gratitude for the good which he has received from humanity. Many a man has a feeling that although he had derived no good and perfect gifts from humanity, still that he should and would serve his fellow-men; in short, the love of mankind is in many a heart deeper than the conscious debt of gratitude. We are, furthermore, distinguished from Positivists in not exacting special recognition of Auguste Comte and his services. Nor do we, like the Positivists, recognise for a moment that the basis of religious fellowship is the sum total of all the positive sciences constituting the philosophic doctrine of the universe. We believe that science becomes an unjust dogma the moment it is made the basis of a Church. The worship of Humanity and the doctrines of positive sciences are the Positivist bond, while ours is simply the furtherance of good character and right conduct.

Equally distinct are we also from the Secularists. The Secularists, as their very name implies, are reactionists against theology; whereas we demand simply that theology be not made the condition of spiritual fellowship. Moreover, the Secularists, while affirming the dignity and worth of this world, and attempting to reconstruct society, do not lay down good character and right conduct as the starting-point of all social reform; in this we are more definite than they; they are in danger of incoherence—now setting up political power and now industrial revolution as the true means of making society happy and just; whereas we would start from the moral sentiment and recognise that mechanical changes in institutions and the execution of better laws must be supported by the moral consciousness of the community. Environment and law also affect character; but the impetus toward the doing away with evil conditions of life must arise in men who are bound together for the spread of goodness in the world.

We are also distinguished from the Socialists. I for one never met a sincere Socialist who did not, like ourselves, have the good of the world at heart; but, as the Church condemns any one who does not believe in a personal God by excluding him from fellowship, so the Socialists, by the

very fact that they name themselves Socialists, condemn all who do not believe in the transference of the ownership of land and capital from private citizens to the State. Whether the Socialistic policy is in itself right or not is not the question on which we can take issue with them. We simply say that their doctrine of reform should not be the basis of spiritual fellowship among men. An Ethical Society would include both Socialists and Individualists, permitting each group to work in its own way for the elevation of society; but would not allow either for the sake of his especial remedy to break the bond of human brotherhood with those who differ from them. The Ethical Society Movement believes that it will draw to itself many men and women from all kinds of Christian Churches and from all non-Christian fellowships. It believes, further, that its influence will affect even those who remain in old fellowships until they will transform these into Ethical Societies; and if devotion to the good in the world be the right bond of religious fellowship, it would be strange if this movement of ours did not tend to conciliate all conflicting groups of earnest men. Thus without swerving from the straight line of our conviction we feel sure that we shall draw all men into brotherhood. We are not a new Church, as Churchmen themselves define a Church; and we do not pretend to be; we have no desire to destroy the old Church, but to vivify it until it shall throw off all except the vital element of fellowship, devotion to the good in the world. Our first and main doctrine, then, is this which I have been stating. We would go about everywhere, but especially among the poor and the down-trodden, urging men into this higher fellowship which we believe will prove the salvation of the world from misery and from moral evil.

Our second doctrine is that each man must bestow the highest reverence of his heart, the feeling of absolute sacredness and inviolability upon the doing of every individual duty as it presents itself to him. In fervour of devotion, in the sense of absolute and supreme worth and dignity, each duty is to be done; and, so far as the feeling of inviolability has been an element in religion, we affirm that the doing of duty is religion: with us every attack upon iniquity is a religious crusade. In this respect we are like the Salvation Army, which goes forth to fight sin. Every individual social reform which we take up becomes to us, in sacredness at least, a religious task. For us goodness must exist in human hearts and institutions; and to bring it into existence is the highest that we know. We preach that right conduct is of supreme importance, more important than doctrine, more important than ritual, ay, more important than the worship of God or Christ in the heart. We believe that right conduct is the way and the only way, of a joyful, peaceful, inspiring life. We believe that it is the way to attain a life of perfect selflessness, which has no anxiety for the future either before or after death, which is willing to become what it is at death, if such is the lot in store for us. Devotion to right conduct, we believe, the way, and the only way of freedom from the

haunting presence of our own past transgressions. Complete devotion to the right is the only act of atonement by which we can become reconciled with our past selves. Thus conduct, because it is the way of life to the individual and of gladness to society, is of supreme importance; every other attempt at self-reconciliation or to attain joy and self-confidence is folly and evil. What food is to the hungry man, what water is to the parched lips, what the sun in spring-time is to the trees and flowers, such is right conduct to the inner spiritual life of man. We preach this devotion to the good not only as the bond of fellowship, but as the way of inward peace and life.

Akin to this doctrine of the supreme importance of right conduct, is our affirmation that this human life of ours—even though we have no outlook toward an immortal existence—still contains adequate motive, more than sufficient incentive, to work and to suffer for mankind, and to carry out the severest injunctions of duty. We maintain that the grandeur of the motive to be upright and just is not diminished one whit by omitting the ideas of personal immortality, and of a personal God. There are persons who affirm that if these ideas be taken away, although morality would remain, nevertheless, the motive to right action would be deprived of its grandeur; but in saying this they simply declare that for them the grandeur is gone, that in their experience they find themselves lacking motive. And as this statement is based on their personal experience, there is no wisdom in bringing against it logical arguments. We can only set over against it the testimony of our own moral experience—which is, that the motive for right conduct which remains, although we have no thought of God and immortality, is still so sublime—nay, so overpowering, that there is no room in human imagination to admit any additional incentive. If we fancy that there is, it is because we have not yet realized the significance of morality in reference to our individual and social life, however limited, here on earth. What we must do is to train our imagination until we are able to comprehend better the beauty and social significance of holiness. Our doctrine is, that the motive to right conduct, when its significance for our earthly life is fully appreciated, becomes practically infinite in grandeur, and that any one who affirms the contrary is false to moral experience.

When any one asks us, "Why should I do right?" as men sometimes do who think they need the hope of immortality to inspire them to duty, we may find it difficult to give an answer that will satisfy them; as when a blind man asks us what we mean by the sun and the glory of his beams we cannot tell him; and yet it is not because we do not know the sun and his light but because the man is blind. And when a man deaf from his birth asks us what we mean by music and what feelings it stirs in us, we cannot tell. There is such a thing as a defect of moral perception. The unworthiness, the perversion of the moral nature, implied in the question, "Why should I do right?" becomes evident if we make this question

more specific and ask: "Why should I care for and watch over my child? Why should I refrain from beating my wife? Why should I not murder my brother? Why should I not delight in cruelty?" When any one asks us such questions, it is becoming in us to pity and, perhaps, to condemn, but not to argue or reason. Men have asked us: "Why should a man suffer and sacrifice, even his life, if there be no hereafter for him? Why should Jesus go to the Cross if that was to be the end of Jesus?" It is easy to tell why Jesus *would* go to the Cross: He would because He loved His fellow-men, and saw that He could best serve them by dying for them. And it is also easy to tell to a man who loves his fellow-men why Jesus *should* go to the Cross: it is the same reason for which He did go. He ought or should go because it would serve His fellow-men. If any one asks, "Why should I love my fellow-men?" we must say, "Stop! This is blasphemy against mankind, and we will not tolerate it without a protest against such degrading scepticism." Love for mankind we see and feel in our own experience to be inviolable; it is final. Love knows no ulterior motive beyond itself, and will permit no doubt as to the fact that it is its own justification.

And yet let no one imagine that we are mere visionaries and weak-minded idealists as to the moral worth of man. Although we emphasize and believe in a direct appeal to the moral sentiments in man, nevertheless we recognise that belief in a personal God, and the hope of immortality, have helped to keep men up to the line of duty; and if we had nothing to fall back upon but the direct love of righteousness, we should count our movement weak indeed. But we recognise that besides love for mankind and conscience there are many other motives to which we could appeal as supports to the moral life. These motives are lower; but nevertheless are necessary, and serve the cause of goodness. Besides the inward moral sanction to right action, we would set before men the four other sanctions: first, we recognise that nine times out of ten among the uneducated classes of society wrong-doing is due to ignorance of the natural consequences of the wrong act upon the bodies and minds and fortunes of the doers. We would aim to remove this ignorance, thus bringing home to men's imagination the evils to which they unwillingly or thoughtlessly expose themselves. The natural consequences, which we call the natural sanction of conduct, thus furnish us with a powerful appeal to enlightened self-interest. But to the natural sanction may be added the legal sanction which attaches in society to the coarser forms of wrong-doing; and to both these the social sanction, the praise and blame of one's neighbours, may come in as a powerful supplement. The love of approbation and the fear of disgrace may be made a thousandfold more effective than they are to-day. Besides this we can develop sympathy, and thus bring to our aid the desire to avoid the pain of seeing others suffer, and to gain the pleasure of seeing others happy.

But to teach these aids to character and conduct is only a part of our

undertaking as an Ethical Movement. Preaching is not our chief means of furthering the spread of goodness throughout society. We shall also attempt, so far as lies in our power, to change the physical and social environment of men, so that it shall be more favourable to a truly human life. We expect the members of our society to do more for the community than the current morality of the day demands. We recognise that work for mankind of every wise sort is the most eloquent preaching. There is no way to convince people that one believes in brotherhood like proving one's self a brother.

THE GOSPEL OF SECULARISM.

By G. W. FOOTE.

THE old faiths ruin and rend, and the air is vocal with the clamour of new systems, each protesting itself *the* Religion of the Future. Sweet sentimental Deism claims first attention, because it retains what is thought to be the essence of old beliefs after discarding their reality. Next comes Positivism, far nobler and more vital, which manages to make itself well heard, having a few strong and skilful pleaders, who never lose sight of their creed whatever subject they happen to be treating. But Secularism, which, in England at least, is numerically far more important than Positivism, although gladly heard by thousands of common people, is scarcely known at all in circles of highest education where its principles are most powerfully operant.

Yet the word *secular* is entering more and more into our general vocabulary, and in especial has become associated with that view of national education which denies the propriety of religious teaching in Board Schools. This use of the word points to the principle on which Secularism is based. The interests of this world and life are *secular*, and can be estimated and furthered by our unaided intellects; the interests of another life and world can be dealt with only by appealing to *Revelation*. Secularism proposes to cultivate the splendid provinces of Time, leaving the theologians to care for the realms of Eternity, and meaning to interfere with them only while their pursuit of salvation in another life hinders the attainment of real welfare in this.

Mr. Gladstone's conception of Secularism, derived of course from its literature, may here be cited. After describing the Sceptic, the Atheist, and the Agnostic he proceeds:—

"Then comes the *Secularist*. Him I understand to stop short of the three former schools in that he does not of necessity assert anything but the positive and exclusive claims of the purposes, the enjoyments, and the needs presented to us in the world of sight and experience. He does not require in principle even the universal suspense of Scepticism; but, putting the two worlds into two scales of value, he finds that the one weighs much, the other either nothing or nothing that can be appreciated. At the utmost he is like a chemist, who, in a testing analysis, after putting into percentage all that he can measure, if he finds something behind so minute as to refuse any quantitative estimate, calls it by the name of trace." ¹

¹ *Contemporary Review*, June, 1876.

This account of Secularism is on the whole very fair, but evidently it requires much amplification before it can be perfectly understood by those who have not, like Mr. Gladstone, read secular literature for themselves.

Were I obliged to give an approximate definition of Secularism in one sentence, I should say that it is naturalism in morals as distinguished from supernaturalism; meaning by this that the criterion of morality is derivable from reason and experience, and that its ground and guarantee exist in human nature independently of any theological belief. Mr. G. J. Holyoake, whose name is inseparably associated with Secularism, says: "Secularism relates to the present existence of man and to actions the issue of which can be tested by the experience of life." And again: "Secularism means the moral duty of man deduced from considerations which pertain to this life alone. Secularism purposes to regulate human affairs by considerations purely human." The second of these quotations is clearly more comprehensive than the first, and is certainly a better expression of the view entertained by the vast majority of Secularists. It dismisses theology from all control over the practical affairs of this life, and banishes it to the region of speculation. The commonest intelligence may see that this doctrine, however innocent it looks on paper, is in essence and practice revolutionary. It makes a clean sweep of all that theologians regard as most significant and precious. Dr. Newman, in his *Grammar of Assent*, writes: "By Religion I mean the knowledge of God, of His will, of our duties towards Him"; and he adds that the channels which nature furnishes for our acquiring this knowledge "teach us the Being and Attributes of God, our responsibility to Him, our dependence upon Him, our prospect of reward or punishment, to be somehow brought about, according as we obey or disobey Him." A better definition of what is generally deemed religion could not be found, and such religion as this Secularism will have no concern with. From their point of view orthodox teachers are justified in calling it irreligious; but those Secularists who agree with Carlyle that whoever believes in the infinite nature of Duty has a religion, repudiate the epithet *irreligious* just as they repudiate the epithet *infidel*, for the popular connotation of both includes something utterly inapplicable to Secularism as they understand it. Properly speaking, they assert, Secularism is not irreligious, but untheological; yet, as it entirely excludes from the sphere of human duty what most people regard as religion, it must explain and justify itself.

Secularism rejects theology as a guide and authority in the affairs of this life, because its pretensions are not warranted by its evidence. Natural Theology, to use a common but half paradoxical phrase, never has been nor can be aught but a body of speculation, admirable enough in its way, perhaps, but quite irreducible to the level of experience. Indeed, one's strongest impression in reading treatises on that branch of metaphysics is, that they are not so much proofs as excuses of faith, and would never have been written if the ideas sought to be verified had not already been

enounced in Revelation. As for Revealed Religion, it is based upon miracles, and these to the scientific mind are altogether inadmissible, being trebly discredited. In the first place, they are at variance with the general fact of order in nature, the largest vessel or conception into which all our experiences flow; adverse to the law of Universal Causation which underlies all scientific theories, and guides all scientific research. Next, the natural history of miracles shows us how they arise, and makes us view them as phenomena of superstition, manifesting a certain coherence and order because the human imagination which gave birth to them is subject to laws, however baffling and subtle. All miracles had their origin from one and the same natural source. The belief in their occurrence invariably characterizes certain stages of mental development, and gradually fades away as these are left farther and farther behind. They are not *historical* but *psychological* phenomena, not *actual* but merely *mental*, not *proofs* but *results* of faith. The miracles of Christianity are no exception to this rule; they stand in the same category as all others. As Mr. Arnold aptly observes: "The time has come when the minds of men no longer put as a matter of course the Bible miracles in a class by themselves. Now, from the moment this time commences, from the moment that the comparative history of all miracles is a conception entertained, and a study admitted, the conclusion is certain, the reign of the Bible miracles is doomed." Lastly, miracles are discredited for the reason insisted on by Mr. Greg, namely, that if we admit them, they prove nothing but the fact of their occurrence. If God is our Author, He has endowed us with reason, and to the bar of that reason the utterances of the most astounding miracle-workers must ultimately come; if condemned there, the miracles will afford them no aid; if approved there, the miracles will be to them useless.

Miracles, then, are fatally discredited in every way. Yet upon them all Revelations are founded, and even Christianity, as Dr. Newman urged against the orators of the Tamworth Reading Room, "is a history supernatural, and almost scenic." Thus, if Natural Theology is merely speculative, and irreducible to the level of experience, Revealed Religion, though more substantial, is erected upon a basis which modern science and criticism have hopelessly undermined.

Now, if we relinquish belief in miracles, we cannot retain belief in Special Providence, and the Efficacy of Prayer, for these are simply aspects of the miraculous. Good-natured Adolf Naumann, the young German artist in *Middlemarch*, was not inaccurate, though facetious, in assuring Will Ladislaw that through him, as through a particular hook or claw, the universe was straining towards a certain picture yet to be painted; for every present phenomenon, whether trivial or important, occurs here, and now, rather than elsewhere and at some other time, by virtue of the whole universal past. All the forces of nature have conspired to place where it is the smallest grain of sand on the seashore, just as much as

their interplay has strewed the æther-floated constellations of illimitable space. The slightest interference with natural sequence implies a disruption of the whole economy of things. Who suspends one law of nature suspends them all. The pious supplicator for just a little rain in time of drought really asks for a world-wide revolution in meteorology. And the dullest intellects, even of the clerical order, are beginning to see this. As a consequence, prayers for rain in fine weather, or for fine weather in time of rain, have fallen almost entirely into disuse; and the most orthodox can now enjoy that joke about the clerk who asked his rector what was the good of praying for rain with the wind in that quarter! Nay, more, so far has the belief in the efficacy of prayer died out, that misguided simpletons, who persist in conforming to apostolic injunction and practice, and in taking very explicit passages in the gospels to mean what the words express, are regarded as Peculiar People in the fullest sense of the term; and if through their primitive pathology children should die under their hands, they run a serious risk of imprisonment for manslaughter, notwithstanding that the book which has misled them is declared to be God's Word by the law of the land. Occasionally, indeed, old habits assert themselves, and the nation suffers a recrudescence of superstition. When the life of the Prince of Wales was threatened by a malignant fever, prayers for his recovery were publicly offered up, and the wildest religious excitement mingled with the most loyal anxiety. But the newspapers were largely responsible for this; they fanned the excitement daily, until many people grew almost as feverish as the Prince himself, and "irreligious persons who preserved their sanity intact smiled when they read in the most unblushingly mendacious of those papers exclamations of piety, and saintly allusions to the great national wave of prayer surging against the Throne of Grace. The Prince's life was spared, thanks to a good constitution and the highest medical skill, and a national thanksgiving was offered up in St. Paul's. Yet the doctors were not forgotten; the chief of them was made a knight, and the nation demanded a rectification of the drainage in the Prince's palace, probably thinking that, although prayer had been found efficacious, there might be danger in tempting Providence a second time.

Soon after that interesting event Mr. Spurgeon modestly observed that the philosophers were noisy enough in peaceful times, but shrank into their holes like mice when imminent calamity threatened the nation; which may be true without derogation to the philosophers who, like wise men, do not bawl against popular madness, but reserve their admonitions until the heated multitude is calm and repentant. Professor Tyndall has invited the religious world to test the alleged efficacy of prayer by practical experiment, such as allotting a ward in some hospital to be specially prayed for, and inquiring whether more cures are recorded in it than elsewhere. But this invitation has not been and never will be accepted. Superstitious always dislike contact with science and fact; they prefer to float about in the vague of sentiment, where pursuit is hopeless, and no obstacles impede.

If there is any efficacy in prayer, how can we account for the disastrous and repeated failure of righteous causes, and the triumph of bad? The thoughtful poor have sought appeasement of their terrible hunger, for some nobler life than is possible while poverty deadens every fine impulse, and frustrates every unselfish thought, but whenever did prayer bring them aid? The miserable have cried for comfort, sufferers for some mitigation of their pain, captives for deliverance, the oppressed for freedom, and those who have fought the great fight of good against ill, for some ray of hope to lighten despair; but what answer has been vouchsafed?

The dying words of Tennyson's Arthur—"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of"—are a weak solace to those who recognise its futility, and find life too stern for optimistic dreams. Salvation, in this life at least, cometh not by prayer, but by valiant effort under the guidance of wisdom, and the inspiration of love. Knowledge alone is power. Ignorant of nature's laws, we are broken to pieces and ground to dust; knowing them, we win an empire of enduring civilization within her borders. Recognising the universal reign of law, and the vanity of supplicating its reversal, and finding no special law in the statutes of the universe for man's behoof, Secularism dismisses as merely superstitious the idea of an arbitrary special providence, and affirms Science to be the only available Providence of man.

Thus theological conceptions obtruded upon the sphere of secular interests are one by one expelled. We now come to the last, and, as the majority of people think, the most serious and important—namely, the doctrine of a Future Life and of Future Reward and Punishment. Mr. Gladstone says that, putting this world and the next into two scales of value, the Secularist finds that the one weighs much, the other either nothing, or nothing that can be appreciated. This is very near the truth. Secularism, as such, neither affirms nor denies a future life; it simply professes no *knowledge* of such a state, no information respecting it which might serve as a guide in the affairs of this life. The first question to be asked concerning the alleged life beyond the grave is, Do we *know* aught about it? If there were indisputably a future life in store for us all, and that life immortal, and if we could obtain precise information of its actualities and requirements, then indeed the transcendence of eternal over temporal interests would impel us to live here with a view to the great Hereafter. But *have* we any knowledge of this future life? Mere conjectures will not suffice; they may be true, but more probably false, and we cannot sacrifice the certain to the uncertain, or forego the smallest present happiness for the sake of an imagined future compensation. Have we any *knowledge* of a life beyond the grave? The Secularist answers, decisively, No.

Whatever the progress of science or philosophy may hereafter reveal, at present we know nothing of personal immortality. The mystery of Death, if such there be, is yet unveiled, and inviolate still are the secrets of the grave. Science knows nothing of another life than this; when we are

dead, she sees but decomposing matter ; and while we live, she regards us but as the highest order of animal life, differentiated from other orders by clearly defined characteristics, but separated from them by no infinite impassable chasm. Neither can Philosophy enlighten us. She reveals to us the laws of what we call mind, but cannot acquaint us with any second entity called soul. Even if we accept Schopenhauer's theory of will, and regard man as a conscious manifestation of the one supreme force, we are no nearer to personal immortality ; for, if our soul emerged at birth from the unconscious infinite, it will probably immerse therein at death, just as a wave rises and flashes foam-created in the sun, and plunges back into the ocean for ever. Indeed, the doctrine of man's natural immortality is so incapable of proof, that many eminent Christians even are abandoning it in favour of the doctrine that everlasting life is a gift specially conferred by God upon the faithful elect. Their appeal is to Revelation, by which they mean the New Testament, all other scriptures being to them gross impositions. But can Revelation satisfy the critical modern spirits ? When we interrogate her, discord deafens us. Every religion—nay, every sect of religion—draws from Revelation its own peculiar answer, and accepts it as infallibly true, although widely at variance with others derived from the same source. These answers cannot all be true, and their very discord discredits each. The voice of God should give forth no such uncertain tidings. If He had indeed spoken, the universe would surely be convinced, and the same conviction fill every breast. Even, however, if Revelation proclaimed but one message concerning the future, and that message were similarly interpreted by all religions, we could not admit it as quite trustworthy, although we might regard it as a vague foreshadowing of truth. For Revelation, unless every genius be considered an instrument through which eternal music is conveyed, must ultimately rely on miracles, and these the modern spirit has derisively rejected. Thus, then, it appears that neither Science, Philosophy, nor Revelation, affords us any knowledge of a future life ; yet, in order to guide our present life with a view to the future, such knowledge is indispensable. In the absence of it we must live in the light of the present, basing our conduct on Secular reason, and working for Secular ends. How far this is compatible with elevated morality and noble idealism we shall presently inquire and decide. Intellectually, Secularism is at one with the most advanced thought of our age, and no immutable dogmas preclude it from accepting and incorporating any new truth. Science being the only providence it recognises, it is ever desirous to see and to welcome fresh developments thereof, assured that new knowledge must harmonize with the old, and deepen and broaden the civilization of our race.

In morals Secularism is utilitarian. In this world only two ethical methods are possible. Either we must take some supposed revelation of God's will as the measure of our duties, or we must determine our actions with a view to the general good. The former course may be very pious, but it is

assuredly unphilosophical. As Feuerbach insists, to derive morality from God "is nothing more than to withdraw it from the test of reason; to institute it as indubitable, unassailable, sacred, without rendering an account *why*." Stout old Chapman's protest against confounding the inherent nature of good is also memorable:—

"Should heaven turn hell
For deeds well done, I would do ever well."

Secularism adopts the latter course. Were it necessary, a defence of utilitarian morality against theological abuse might here be made; but an ethical system which can boast so many noble and illustrious adherents may well be excused from vindicating its right to recognition and respect. Nevertheless, it may be observed that, however fervid are theoretical objections to utilitarianism, its criterion of morality is the only one admitted in practice. Our jurisprudence is not required to justify itself before any theological bar, nor to show its conformity with the maxims uttered by Jesus and His disciples; and he would be thought a strange legislator who should insist on testing the value of a Parliamentary Bill by appealing to the New Testament. Secularism holds that whatever actions conduce to the general good are right, and that whatever have an opposite tendency are wrong. manifold objections are urged against this simple rule on the ground of its impracticability; but as all of them apply with equal force to every conceivable rule, they may be peremptorily dismissed. The imperfections of human nature must affect the practicability of any moral law, however conceived or expressed. Christians who wrote before Secularism had to be combated, never thought of maintaining that reason and experience are inefficient guides, although they did sometimes impugn the efficacy of natural motives to good. So thoughtful and cautious a preacher as Barrow, whom Mr. Arnold accounts the best moral divine of our English Church, says that "wisdom is, in effect, the genuine parent of all moral and political virtue, justice, and honesty." But some theologically-minded persons, whose appearance betrays no remarkable signs of asceticism, wax eloquent in reprobation of happiness as a sanction of morality at all. Duty, say they, is what all should strive after. Good; but the Secularist conceives it *his* duty to promote the general welfare. Happiness is not a degrading thing, but a source of elevation. We have all enjoyed the wonderful catechism of Pig-Philosophy in *Latter-day Pamphlets*. What a scathing satire on the wretched Jesuitism abounding within and without the churches, and bearing such malign and malodorous fruit! But it is not the necessary antithesis to the Religion of Sorrow. It is the mongrel makes gift of those "whose gospel is their maw," whose swinishness makes them contemplate nature as a universal swine's-trough, with plenty of pig's-wash for those who can thrust their fellows aside and get their paw in it. The Religion of Gladness is a different thing from this. Let us hear its great prophet, Spinoza, one of the purest and noblest of modern minds: "Joy is the passage from a less to a greater perfection; sorrow is the pas-

sage from a greater to a less perfection." No, suffering only tries, it does not nourish us ; it proves our capacity, but does not produce it. What, after all, is happiness? It consists in the fullest healthy exercise of all our faculties, and is as various as they. Far from ignoble, it implies the highest normal development of our nature, the dream of Utopists from Plato downwards. And therefore, in affirming happiness to be the great purpose of social life, Secularism makes its moral law coincident with the law of man's progress towards attainable perfection.

Motives to righteousness Secularism finds in human nature. Since the evolution of morality has been traced by scientific thinkers, the idea of our moral sense having had a supernatural origin has vanished into the limbo of superstitions. Our social sympathies are a natural growth, and may be indefinitely developed in the future by the same means which have developed them in the past. Morality and theology are essentially distinct. The ground and guarantee of morality are independent of any theological belief. When we are in earnest about the right, we need no incitement from above. Morality has its natural ground in experience and reason, in the common nature and common wants of mankind. Wherever sentient beings live together in a social state, simple or complex, laws of morality must arise, for they are simply the permanent conditions of social health ; and even if men entertained no belief in any supernatural power, they would still recognise and submit to the laws upon which societary welfare depends. "Even"—says Dr. Martineau—"though we came out of nothing, and returned to nothing, we should be subject to the claim of righteousness so long as we are what we are : morals have their own base and are second to nothing." Emerson, a religious transcendentalist, also admits that "truth, frankness, courage, love, humility, and all the virtues range themselves on the side of prudence, on the art of securing a present well-being." The love professed by piety to God is the same feeling, though differently directed, which prompts the commonest generousities and succours of daily life. All moral appeals must ultimately be made to our human sympathies. Theological appeals are essentially not moral, but immoral. The hope of heaven and the fear of hell are motives purely personal and selfish. Their tendency is rather to make men worse than better. They may secure a grudging compliance with prescribed rules, but they must depress character instead of elevating it. They tend to concentrate a man's whole attention on himself, and thus to develop and intensify his selfish propensities. No man, as Dr. Martineau many years ago observed, can faithfully follow his highest moral conceptions who is continually casting side-glances at the prospects of his own soul. Secularism appeals to no lust after posthumous rewards or dread of posthumous terrors, but to that fraternal feeling which is the vital essence of all true religion, and has prompted heroic self-sacrifice in all ages and climes. It removes moral causation from the next world to this. It teaches that the harvest of our sowing will be reaped here, and to the last grain eaten, by

ourselves or others. Every act of our lives affects the whole subsequent history of our race. Our mental and moral like our bodily lungs have their appropriate atmospheres, of which every thought, word, and act becomes a constituent atom. Incessantly around us goes on the conflict of good and evil, which a word, a gesture, a look of ours changes. And we cannot tell how great may be the influence of the least of these, for in nature all things hang together, and the greatest effects may flow from causes seemingly slight and inconsiderable. When we thoroughly lay this to heart, and reflect that no contrition or remorse can undo the past or efface the slightest record from the everlasting Book of Fate, we shall be more strongly restrained from evil and impelled to good than we could be by supernatural promises or threats. The promises may be mistrusted, the threats nullified by a late repentance; but the natural issues of conduct are inevitable, and must be faced. Whatever the future may hold in store, Secularism bids us be true to ourselves and our opportunities now. It does not undertake to determine the vexed question of God's existence, which it leaves each to decide for himself according to what light he has; nor does it dogmatically deny the possibility of a future life. But it insists on utilizing to the highest the possibilities that lie before us, and realizing as far as may be by practical agencies that Earthly Paradise which would now be less remote if one tithe of the time, the energy, the ability, the enthusiasm, and the wealth devoted to making men fit candidates for another life had been devoted to making them fit citizens of this. If there be a future life, this must be the best preparation for it; and if not, the consciousness of humane work achieved and duty done, will tint with rainbow and orient colours the mists of death more surely than expected glories from the vague and mystic land of dreams.

There are those who cannot believe in any effective morality, much less any devotion to disinterested aims, without the positive certainty of immortal life. Under a pretence of piety they cloak the most grovelling estimate of human nature, which, with all its faults, is infinitely better than their conception of it. Even their love and reverence of God would seem foolishness, unless they were assured of living for ever. Withdraw posthumous hopes and fears, say they; and "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," would be the sanest philosophy. In his grave way Spinoza satirizes this "vulgar opinion" which enjoins a regulation of life according to the passions of those who have "persuaded themselves that the souls perish with the bodies, and that there is not a second life for *the miserable who have borne the crushing weight of piety.*" "A conduct," he adds, "as absurd, in my opinion, as that of a man who should fill his body with poisons and deadly food for the fine reason that he had no hope to enjoy wholesome nourishment for all eternity; or who, seeing that the soul is not eternal or immortal, should renounce his reason, and wish to become insane: things so preposterous that they are scarcely worth mention."

Others, again, deny that a philosophy which ignores the Infinite can

have any grand ideal capable of lifting us above the petty hums and sordid passions of life. But surely the idea of service to the great Humanity, whose past and future are to us practically infinite, is a conception vast enough for our finite minds. The instincts of Love, Reverence, and Service may be fully exercised and satisfied by devotion to a purely human ideal, without resort to unverifiable dogmas and inscrutable mysteries. And Secularism, which bids us think and act so that the great Human Family may profit by our lives; which exhorts us to labour for human progress and elevation here on earth, where effort may be effective and sacrifices must be real; is more profoundly noble than any supernatural creed; and holds the promise of a wider and loftier beneficence.

Secularism is often said to be atheistic. It is, however, neither atheistic nor theistic. It ignores the problem of God's existence, which seems insoluble to finite intellects, and confines itself to the practical world of experience, without commending or forbidding speculation on matters that transcend it. Unquestionably many Secularists are Atheists, but others are Theists; and this shows the compatibility of Secularism, with either a positive or a negative attitude towards the hypothesis of a supreme universal intelligence. There is no atheistic declaration in the principles of any existing secular society, although all are unanimous in opposing theology—which is at best an elaborate conjecture, and at the worst an elaborate and pernicious imposture.

Educated humanity has now arrived at the *positive* stage of culture. Imagination, it is true, will ever hold its legitimate province; but it is the kindling and not the guiding element in our nature. When exercising its proper influence, it invests all things with "a light that never was on sea or land"; it transforms lust into love, it creates the ideal, it nurtures enthusiasm, it produces heroism, it suggests all the glories of art, and even lends wings to the intellect of the scientist. But when it is substituted for knowledge, when it aims at becoming the leader instead of the kindler, it becomes a Phaethon who drives to disaster and ruin. It is degrading, or at any rate perilous, to be the dupe of fancy, however beautiful or magnificent. Reason should always hold sovereign sway in our minds, and reason tells us that we live in a universe of cause and effect, where ends must be accomplished by means, and where man himself is largely fashioned by circumstances. Reason tells us that our faculties are limited, and that our knowledge is relative; it enjoins us to believe what is ascertained, to give assent to no proposition of whose truth we are not assured, and to walk in the light of facts. This may seem a humble philosophy, but it is sound, and not uncheerful, and it stands the wear and tear of life when prouder philosophies are often reduced to rags and tatters. Nor is it just to call this philosophy "negative." Every system, indeed, is negative to every other system which it in any wise contradicts; but in what other sense can a system be called negative which leaves men all science to study, all art to pursue and enjoy, and all humanity to love and serve? It declines to

traffic in supernatural hopes and fears, but it preserves all the sacred things of civilization, and gives a deeper meaning to such words as husband and wife, father and mother, brother and sister, lover and friend.

Incidentally, however, Secularism has what some will always persist in regarding as negative. It finds noxious superstitions impeding its path, and must oppose them. It cannot ignore orthodoxy, although it would be glad to do so, for the dogmas and pretensions of the popular creed hinder its progress and thwart secular improvement at every step. Favoured, and privileged, and largely supported by the State, they usurp a fictitious dignity ever less popular ideas. They thrust themselves into education, insist on teaching supernaturalism with the multiplication table, dose the scholars with Jewish mythology as though it were actual history, and assist their moral development with pictures of Daniel in the lions' den, and Jesus walking on the sea. They employ vast wealth in preparing for another world which might be more profitably employed in bettering this. They prevent us from spending our Sunday rationally, refusing us any alternative but the church or the public-house. They deprive honest sceptics, as far as possible, of the common rights of citizenship. They retard a host of reforms, and still do the utmost to suppress or curtail freedom of thought and speech. While all this continues, Secularism must actively oppose the popular creed. Nor is it just on the part of the Christians to stigmatize this aggressive attitude. They forget that their faith was vigorously and persistently aggressive against Paganism. Secularism may surely imitate that example, although it neither intends nor desires to demolish the temples of Christianity, as the early Christians, headed by their bishops, destroyed the temples of Paganism, and desecrated its shrines.

Properly speaking, Secularism is doing a positive, not a negative, work in destroying superstition. Every error removed makes room for truth; and if superstition is a kind of mental disease, he who expels it is a mental physician. His work is no more negative than the doctor's who combats a bodily malady, drives it out of the system, and leaves his patient in the full possession of health.

Secularism, like all new systems, appealing to the dissatisfied rather than the contented, its staunchest adherents are found among the *élite* of the working classes. Inquire closely into the *personnel* of advanced movements, and you will find Secularists there out of all proportion to their numerical strength. They are obliged to work in this individual manner, for the bigotry against Secularism is still so strong that few dare to recognize its organizations. They have always assisted the cause of National Education, and now it is carried they are getting their members on School Boards, and doing their utmost to improve the quality of the instruction given to children, as well as to preserve them from the nefarious influence of the priests. They promote Sunday freedom, they are advocates of international peace, they are sturdy friends of justice, they are firm supporters of the emancipation of women, they are lovers of mental and

personal liberty, and they are actively on the side of every political and social reform. Where Christians *may* be they are *sure* to be ; not because they necessarily have better hearts than their orthodox neighbours, but because their principles impel them to fight for Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, irrespective of nationality, race, sex, or creed ; and prompt them to exclaim, in the sublime language of Thomas Paine : " The world is my country, and to do good is my religion."

A NATIONAL CHURCH.

BY ARTHUR W. HUTTON, M.A.

THE subject on which I am to address you this afternoon may seem somewhat unconnected with that general series which has been carried on here during the past winter with so much success. I think, however, that I shall be able to show you that this is not really the case. If there is one impression more likely than any other to remain fixed in the minds of those who have attended any considerable number of these lectures, it is this: That religion is an immensely important thing; that national welfare, and indeed human civilization and progress, have been intimately associated with religion throughout the whole period of human history; that while particular religions have sprung into existence here or there, have grown to maturity, and then have slowly died out or have left but flickering embers to commemorate their past importance, the religious spirit itself seems to be immortal, and men seem always to need a field for the exercise of their religious emotions, as much as they always need food, and drink, and clothing.

Now all the lectures of this course hitherto delivered have dealt with religions of the past or religions of the present. Next Sunday week, Dr. Stanton Coit is to speak on what may fairly be termed the religion of the future. It is true that he does not claim for ethical culture the name of religion—he holds that the use of the word in that connection might prove misleading. But since the essence of all that is best in all religions, past or present, lies in their inculcation of duty, in their advocacy of the paramount importance of righteousness, of morality, of ethics—for all mean the same thing; I do not think we need trouble much about the word, one way or the other. And before I go farther, it may serve to remove any possible misconceptions as to what I am driving at, when I proceed to state my views on the subject of a National Church, if I say at once that I profess myself to be a disciple of this religion of the future, a student in the school of ethical culture, a believer in the supreme law of righteousness; and if I do not add a disciple of Dr. Coit personally, it is partly because I claim to have played the part of his John the Baptist here at South Place; for, more than four years ago (before I had the pleasure of hearing his name or of learning anything about the movement for ethical culture in America), in a lecture delivered in this hall one Sunday morning, on the moral training of children, I followed—crudely perhaps, but definitely—the same general lines that are now so ably enforced here, week after week.

My business, however, this afternoon, is not to speak on ethical culture, but on a National Church; and I shall place before you my grounds for holding that, in view of the transition, slow but inevitable, from the old to the new, an organization such as we in England possess in our National Church, is of immense value; and that instead of being destroyed—supposing its destruction to be possible—or, instead of being handed over to what would thenceforward be a narrow and powerful sect, it should remain a department of the State, and be popularized, liberalized, nationalized, so as to provide a home, as free as may be from pertinence and obscurantism, in which the national religious sentiment may develop naturally.

Starting, then, from the point of view that religion is the highest form of education, that its inculcation and its practice mean the training of the moral sense; and leaving out of sight for the moment the fact that popular religion invariably associates a great deal of superstition with this system of ethical training; we are pointed towards the conclusion that, on principles which may be described as socialistic, there is nothing inconsistent with justice in the abstract idea of an Established Church. On the contrary, if it be right that the community should combine for elementary education, and for technical education, it cannot be wrong that it should further combine for ethical education. And if it were possible to establish religion in this sense of promoting the highest intellectual and moral cultivation of the individual, whether youthful or mature, it would, I take it, be the duty everywhere of the State to establish religion. It is only because religion is so confused in men's minds with Ecclesiasticism and Clericalism that this common-sense view of the matter is neglected or forgotten. But the case we have before us is not an abstract one; and while I shall have to admit that some aspects of it render it less favourable to my contention, I hope to be able to point out that on various grounds the reasons for retaining an existing Establishment, such as we have in the Church of England, are weightier than the more abstract reasons by which a State maintenance of religion in general would be defended.

Now, in order to clear the ground, I will first indicate certain questions partly political and partly ecclesiastical, with which I have nothing to do.

The Disestablishment, twenty years ago, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland has no bearing on the case before us. That was not a popular Church, but a garrison Church. It represented the English conquest of Ireland, and very little else. In my sense of the term it was not a State Church, for it was a foreign State Church; and on the principle of popular supremacy it was bound in justice to be deprived of its ascendancy. None of us regret its Disestablishment; some of us, however, do regret the far too partial Disendowment to which it was subjected. Those funds, of which it had the administration as an Established Church, were national funds, bequeathed originally by pious Irishmen in olden times for the maintenance of the Catholic religion, and diverted from their original intention at the time of the Reformation. You may say they should have

been restored to the existing Roman Catholic Church in Ireland ; and at the first hearing this sounds most plausible. But on reflection we see the justice of the contention that the national welfare is to be preferred to all else ; and since no living Catholic in Ireland could be said to be wronged by not having these funds transferred back to his Church after three centuries of misappropriation, we are allowed to conclude that what was originally intended for the benefit of the nation, and especially of the poor, is best devoted to the service of the whole nation, in such matters as education, which concern its social welfare, and that apart from the narrowing guidance of conflicting Churches. I do not say that Ireland ought not to have an Established Church—that would be in conflict with the general principle I am advocating ; but an Established Church in my view should be the popular Church ; and in Ireland, as things are now, that would be the Catholic Church ; and on its own principles the Catholic Church could not associate itself with the State and submit to popular government on those terms which alone are in my judgment admissible—viz., the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the State : of the Irish State that is, of course, in the present case, as representing the Irish people. But in any case, so large a share of these endowments ought not to have been wasted, as they were, in pensioning off worthless clergymen, who never had any duties worthy the name to perform ; and who, as soon as they were sure of their money, retired to idle away the remainder of their aimless lives at various fashionable watering-places.

Then, again, as to the case of Scotland. Here, it appears, a majority of the people are in favour of Disestablishment ; and if they continue to be of that mind, of course Disestablishment must come. The case differs considerably from that of Ireland ; but it is equally a theological prejudice which makes a liberal Establishment of the kind I have in view impossible in Scotland at the present time. Two-thirds of the population of Scotland are convinced that an alliance between Church and State is prohibited by the words of Christ, when He said, " My kingdom is not of this world." Of course with such transcendental reasoning as this you and I have nothing to do. Our religious kingdom belongs to this world, and to no other ; it is the reign of righteousness on earth that we seek to establish. Such it would seem was also the aim of Christ ; but if two-thirds of the Scottish nation, sincerely holding Him as their Master, are of opinion that He condemns Established Churches, but looks with favour on the United Presbyterians and the Free Kirk, they must on liberal principles have their own way ; and certainly if Disestablishment brings about, as some think it will, the fusion of the three Scotch Kirks, which do not differ from each other on theological grounds, none of us will regret that it has been accomplished.

The case of Wales must also, I think, be dissociated from that of England, on account of the intense unpopularity of the Anglican Church there. It is a striking example of the folly of attempting to maintain a State Church

on any other than a popular basis ; and Prime Ministers in their appointments of unsuitable bishops have been as much to blame as bishops in their appointments of unsuitable clergymen ; and both are responsible for the existing state of things. Now that Disestablishment in Wales has found a place on the political programme, it must, I suppose, sooner or later come ; but after it has come, and when the term " liberal " has come to mean in Wales more what it means with us in London, I think it will be seen that the local population has suffered by surrendering buildings, that were really national property, to an ecclesiastical sect, together with a portion of national endowments—the remainder having passed to the central government, and so ceasing to be under local control. That at least is what is meant by Disestablishment and Disendowment as now proposed.

In the case of England, however, it is less clear which way the popular will inclines ; and while that is so, it is the duty of every one who thinks he sees a more excellent way than that usually advocated, to point out what he believes to be the dangers of the one scheme and what the advantages of the other. Now the great mass of Englishmen who are not members of the Established Church, in the sense that they do not believe the doctrines contained in its Creeds and Articles, and do not attend its services—that is to say, about five-sixths of the adult population—are rather indifferent to the Church than hostile to it. I cannot deny that there are various reasons which might fairly make the Church unpopular. Its clergy are mostly out of sympathy with liberal movements. They are in many cases in receipt of incomes altogether excessive in proportion to the amount of work they do. They do not hold that honourable position in regard to learning and intelligence which the clergy in other countries and at other times have done. Occasionally we hear of grave scandals in the ecclesiastical world, and the ridiculous complexity of the existing ecclesiastical law renders the adequate punishment of the offender difficult, if not impossible. Still, when all has been said, I do not think that the clergy of the Church of England are on the whole unpopular. In the towns especially you will often find earnest, hard-working men—such as Mr. Barnett, of St. Jude's, Whitechapel—who in no patronizing or pharisaical spirit has really the interests of the people at heart ; and, what is to my purpose this afternoon, this spirit seems now to be the growing one, while many of the old ecclesiastical pretensions are silently laid aside. I will give you an illustration of what I mean : A few months ago I was invited to attend a lecture to the London clergy, given at Sion College by Mr. Henry George, and I went. Now you know what kind of a lecture Mr. George would give, so I need not describe that. But the striking thing was the sympathy and enthusiasm which his lecture evoked. It is true there was one old clergyman who listened sadly for a short time, and then, shaking his head, gathered together his umbrella and great coat, and walked out. But there were over a hundred present, and the great mass of them cheered Mr. George over and over again. A few years ago this would have been quite impossible ;

and what is the reflection that it suggests? Why, that if the Church, in spite of the iron bars and gates and bolts with which it has been fenced about, thus shows signs of becoming liberalized from within, it is no small encouragement to those of us who would seek to accelerate that liberalizing process from without. And now, without further preface, I will give you a sketch of what I think the main features of that process should be.

On the one hand it would be a process of freeing the Church from theological and ritual bonds, a matter which would simply be accomplished by the repeal of the Act of Uniformity. I suppose it is not popularly known that the authority which the Prayer-Book possesses in the Church is in virtue of its being the schedule to an Act of Parliament passed nearly two hundred and thirty years ago by the royalist lords and country gentlemen who brought about the restoration of King Charles II. I will not deny these men their merits in their own time; but it is obvious that a body of reactionaries, such as they were, have nothing whatever in common with the progressive religious spirit of the nineteenth century; and yet it is solely in virtue of an enactment approved by them that the Church has become the exclusive body that it is. It was their doing, for example, that none but episcopally ordained clergymen can hold office in the Church. I do not suppose that the full liberty which this simple repeal would secure would at once be realized in practice; nor, indeed, do I think it desirable that it should be. It is right that the system in possession, which long use has endeared to thousands of devout and susceptible people, should be tenderly dealt with. It is only gradually, therefore, that the old order would change, giving place to the new—the new being ultimately that a rational religious service (if service it be rightly called), such as that held here on Sunday mornings, or something better in the same line, could be held (say) in St. Paul's Cathedral, followed by a sermon (if sermon it be rightly called), in which human effort would be invoked to bring about some amelioration in the intellectual, social, or moral condition of those who must stand in need of such aid. In a word, the resources of the Established Church would be devoted to the service of humanity. I say that the mere repeal of Charles II.'s Act of Uniformity would open the way for this desirable consummation—desirable, that is, from the point of view of liberal religious thinkers—but it would not by itself accomplish it. The repeal would free the Church from the cold grasp of the seventeenth century, but the warm touch of the living nineteenth century would be required to bring it abreast of the modern world. How is this to be accomplished? Simply by bringing it under popular control. In theory it is so already; but the control is so very indirect that it is hardly perceptible in its effects—indeed it must, of necessity, be ineffectual as long as the Act of Uniformity is retained, which is absolutely prohibitory of any liberal growth or movement. Still, in theory, the Church is at this moment under popular control; for it is subject to the Royal Supremacy, which is exercised through the Ministry, which comes into power by the presence of a majority

in the House of Commons, which is elected by the people. The Queen nominally appoints the Archbishops and Bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, who in their turn appoint to most other clerical offices; but the Prime Minister really makes the appointments; and he is what he is in virtue of the popular voice; so that the Church is really at this moment under popular control, though the fact is but little appreciated, the popular action being so very indirect. It is important, however, to keep the fact in mind, for two reasons. First, when this control is made, as I hope it will be, more direct and efficient, it will be a reply to such of the clergy as will wish to repudiate their responsibility to the people, asserting that the Church was independent before, whereas it is now strictly subject to the State. And secondly, it is well that our friends who desire Disestablishment should see how their scheme would hand over to an independent ecclesiastical corporation rights of considerable national importance which at present belong to the people.

You will say that the people do not value these rights; know nothing whatever, in fact, about them; and that they may just as well be alienated and handed over to those who would value them, and would exercise them with a due sense of responsibility. I cannot at all accept that view of the matter, though I admit that the people know little, and so care little, about the whole concern. They would care more if they knew more, and realized what interests for themselves and for their children are at stake. This increased interest and knowledge would undoubtedly follow if the popular control became more direct, if it were associated (as I think it should be) with the new system of Local Government. That system is itself as yet only in its infancy; but it has made a good beginning, and doubtless ere long we shall see District Councils as well as County Councils working under the general direction of the Local Government Board, and controlling, among other things, the local administration of education and of the police. It would all be on the same lines if to these same councils were entrusted the local administration of Church affairs. The alternative to Disestablishment which I am advocating would become, in its main features, an accomplished fact, if Parliament entrusted Church patronage and the control of Church property to these representative bodies. That is my main principle—that, together with the repeal of the Act of Uniformity, and now to make my meaning clearer, I must go a little more into detail.

But first I should like to say a word as to what I believe would be the probable results of Disestablishment, so that we may see some of the dangers that we seek to avoid. What would happen if Parliament should disestablish and disendow the Church? Now all schemes hitherto proposed have gone on the principle that the ecclesiastical buildings, the churches and parsonage houses, shall be handed over to the Church, and that vested rights shall be scrupulously respected. Accordingly as each bishop or incumbent dies, the Act would come into operation in respect

of the income of his successor; but his church and house would have become the property of the Church body. What then would be the immediate and visible result of Disestablishment? Nothing, so far as I can see, but the exclusion of the Bishops from the House of Lords. Now this exclusion some years back used to be regarded as a most desirable^{*} consummation. People imagined all kinds of good consequences if it could only be brought about. But who shares those anticipations now? Many of us think it would be well to be rid of the second chamber altogether; others hold that a second elective chamber would be good for the country. But the Bishops are at any rate among the most respectable members of the Upper House; they enter there by merit, and not by the mere fact of birth; and if their appointment were more directly popular than it is at present, I imagine that few men would be better fitted for a place in an Upper Chamber, assuming that the country decides to keep an Upper Chamber at all.

But let us look a little further into this matter of vested rights. A young man of third-rate ability, but with good family connections, gets through the easy preliminaries to ordination, and at the age of twenty-five is given, we will suppose, a rich family living in the country, a year before the Disestablishment Act is passed. For forty or fifty years he may occupy that position with complete independence, although both in character and in teaching he may be altogether objectionable to the people over whom he is placed. I would ask whether his parishioners have no vested rights or interests as well as he? Whether they have not already too long been deprived of the administration of the funds which supply his handsome income? whether they might not claim some part in the management of the church and churchyard—the ornament, perhaps, of the neighbourhood—which will remain this young man's freehold for life. To ask these questions is to answer them; but I have not stated the whole case yet. The advocates of Disestablishment admit that Westminster Abbey, and perhaps the cathedrals, or some of them, must be retained as national monuments, and must not be handed over to the Disestablished Church; but they forget that in some ten or fifteen thousand parishes the old parish church is the only national monument that exists; and that though the villagers may set but little value on the church now, that would not be the case when they find they have a hand in its management, and when improved education shows them its true beauty and use. Let these buildings be handed over to the Disestablished Church, or, more accurately, to the newly-founded episcopal sect, and they cease to be the people's property thenceforth; they will become, presumably, strongholds planted everywhere in the country for the dissemination of a sacerdotal theology which the educated intelligence of the nation has entirely outgrown.

And what benefit will the people receive from the accumulation of funds in the hands of a central government—a process which will begin so soon as the Disestablishment Act has been passed? It is very doubtful whether

they will receive any benefit at all. A good deal will depend on the temper of the times. Should there be a war panic about, very likely the whole story that Disestablishment is expected ultimately to realize will be squandered on fortifications, or on an increase of the navy. Perhaps something might be voted for education—that is, for elementary education; but we should remember that this is already provided for by law; while that higher education, which I take religion to be, has no provision for its maintenance on a liberal platform, and so becomes the property of sects, who, in the struggle for existence, continually narrow its field.

We can, I think, make a tolerable forecast of what the spiritual character of the Disestablished Church would become. It is already accused of a tendency to sacerdotalism, and justly too, so far as I can see; but we must remember that sacerdotalism tempered by State control is less dangerous than it would be without it. A State Church is, on the whole, more liberal than what is called a voluntary one. It was the Free Kirk of Scotland which deprived Professor Robertson Smith of his post at the University on account of heresy; while the Established Kirk retained Principal Tulloch, who was a heretic no less. To give another example: Two Canons of the Church of England have lectured here on Sunday afternoons without rebuke from their ecclesiastical superiors, while the President of the Baptist Union was censured by *The Baptist* for doing the same thing. And it is a necessity of the times that this distinction should become more pronounced. Modern criticism tends more and more to leave no tangible authority but that of the State; and ecclesiastical bodies not connected with the State are more and more driven into those transcendental regions where the eye of faith alone can find a basis for the authority of the Church. This authority must at all hazards be established by them, else they cease to have any *raison d'être*; and hence the growth of sacerdotal and obscurantist doctrines. Starting therefore, as it would, with a majority of High-Church Bishops—for, unfortunately, both Lord Salisbury and the only possible alternative, Mr. Gladstone, are High Churchmen—the Church of England when disestablished would certainly develop its hierarchical pretensions as its ground for claiming authority; and since bold assertions always gain disciples, it is by no means improbable that the Church might become a formidable rival of the State, and that we might suffer here in England, as Italy, France, Germany, and Belgium are suffering, from that detestable conflict between Clericalism and Liberalism—a conflict whose peculiar bitterness is that it frequently divides husband and wife, and makes a man's foes to be those of his own household. It may be urged that the proposed nationalization of the Church would not avert this evil, since the process would be so very unacceptable to the High Church clergy that they would secede and form an independent body outside the National Church. Now, of course, it must be clearly understood that the rights of conscience are sacred on liberal principles, and that there must be no coercion in this matter either physical or spiritual. I take for granted

that a variety of minor sects, as well as the Roman Catholic Church, will for a time, or perhaps permanently, refuse to associate themselves with the National Establishment of religion. Their exclusion will, however, be their own doing; for, of course, the ideal we have before us is that of inclusion as far as possible; and I do not doubt but that the more liberal-minded among the Dissenting congregations—the Unitarians, for example, and many of the Independents—will at once claim to be admitted, and will promptly be welcomed within the National Church. Still sects, with peculiar theological views, and most of all such as have ideas about the special sacredness of their own little Bethel, will decline to be incorporated, and we must not dream of interfering with their liberty. Sooner or later they will die out, while the mere semblance of persecution would only serve to prolong their existence. And to these sects already existing it is quite possible that a secession of some of the High-Church clergy might add a new one, but I do not believe it would be a big affair. There would really be no occasion for it; for the changes I am advocating would not alter fundamentally the constitution of the Established Church, though they would doubtless alter its character and give it freedom. Already it is the creation of the State, and subject to the will of an elected Parliament; already it contains within itself men of the most divergent theological views; the only change would be that these differences would hereafter exist with the most perfect honesty, while now men inside the Church have to strain the interpretation of the Articles and Formularies to which they are legally bound, so as to silence the protests of their own consciences. And I believe the great mass of the clergy would recognise this when the nationalization I have in view had become an accomplished fact; though before its accomplishment they would move heaven and earth to prevent it, and would declare that they would never, never accept any such subjection of the Church to direct popular control. I have myself watched the course of similar ecclesiastical controversies for more than twenty years, and others could testify that the same thing has continued for a very much longer period. It was in 1863 that I was first shown how intolerable was the position of the Church of England, in that her final Court of Appeal was a secular one—the Queen in Council; and I was assured that in no long time, unless the grievance were removed, there would be an exodus from the Established Church compared with which the Disruption of the Scottish Kirk would seem insignificant. But what has happened? The grievance has not been removed, it is there to-day precisely as it was in 1865 and previously; a handful of consistent men, but a mere handful, have gone over to the Roman Catholic Church, which acknowledges no Royal supremacy; but the vast majority have remained where they were, sending from time to time strongly-worded letters to the Church newspapers, still threatening us with the disaster of their secession, which I, for one, do not believe will ever become an accomplished fact. Some of the men with whom I used to talk on these subjects in former years are now

bishops, deans, canons, or, at any rate, beneficed clergymen; and it takes a good deal to make such men move; they seem well content with the "safety-valve" of the so-called Religious Press. Add the same thing would doubtless occur again. A great deal of strong language would be used, with the trifling result of a few secessions; while the bulk of the clergy would soon accommodate themselves to the new order of things; and many of them, to do them justice, would be intensely relieved by their emancipation from theological tests, and would find an immense accession of moral strength and influence in thus being brought into contact with the people among whom they live. Indeed, as I said a few moments ago, although an Act of Parliament could at once entrust the control of Church patronage and ecclesiastical endowments to the local Council, it is not likely that the new authority would exercise its powers in any offensive or tyrannical manner. If, for example, you ask me what I think would be the immediate result if the London County Council were entrusted with the appointment of the next Bishop of London, I should say they would choose Mr. Barnett, of Whitechapel; that is to say, while the repeal of the Act of Uniformity would leave them absolutely unfettered in their choice, so that any one—clergyman or layman, of whatever theological views—might be appointed, they would feel bound to select a man having the technical qualifications which the majority of those interested would regard as indispensable, while they would be careful to find one whose religion it is to serve the people's cause.

Perhaps I have put it rather too broadly in saying that their choice would be "absolutely unfettered." I mean only that the existing restrictions, which require the formalities of an episcopal ordination or consecration, together with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and a promise to use no services but those of the Prayer-Book in public worship—all these would have been removed; but certain qualifications would, of course, be necessary—moral and intellectual qualifications; and these should, I think, be insisted upon far more seriously than they are at present. What is especially required in the liberal clergyman of the future is what we call "character"; and it is just this which the present method of selection leaves out of account, if it does not go far to exclude it. The superstition which represents the ceremony of Ordination as having an effect in moralizing or spiritualizing a man is partly responsible for this. Bishops are content to accept men intellectually and morally weak, believing that Ordination will somehow set matters right. Any one who is at all familiar with the life of our Universities in recent years knows how few comparatively of the "strong" men now become candidates for Ordination. They may have the best qualifications for discharging the best kind of clerical duties; but, unless they have some transcendental theory as to the authoritative basis of theological systems, they cannot accommodate their consciences to the required declarations of assent and consent to all that the Bible and Prayer-Book contain.

And so they turn their thoughts in quite other directions ; and the great and pressing work of moral education, of ethical culture, gets no help from them. But who are the men who find little or no difficulty in getting ordained; and in so becoming qualified for office in the National Church? Until recently it was a pre-requisite, very seldom dispensed with, that they should have taken a University Degree. That, of course, is not difficult when it is merely a pass without honours. But very little else is wanted. A certificate of having attended a course of twelve lectures; an easy examination in what is called theology, involving only a superficial acquaintance with a few books of no scientific, and of third-rate literary value; a testimonial as to character from three clergymen, who need know but very little about the man—and that is all; while of these few and easy conditions, the most important one, the University Degree, is now dispensed with as frequently as it is demanded, because the obsolescence of the required theology makes it necessary that the bishops should put up with the lack of academical training. They would not get half as many men as they want if they insisted on it. Popular control would here, I am confident, bring about a much-needed reform. It would insist on intellectual ability and cultivation; it would not require a declaration of assent to theological dogmas; it would demand men of tried moral strength, it would not rely upon an antique ceremony to provide them with spiritual power and character.

I do not say that the change would come at once. It is a necessity of the case that it should be gradual. But sooner or later we should have a national clergy, abreast of the intellectual and moral progress of the times, no longer a separate caste, wearing a peculiar dress, as if they claimed to be a different species from the rest of their fellow-men, but owing their claim to spiritual leadership to their superior culture, enlightenment, character; and I do not believe the time will ever come when there will be no need of such men. The National Church, when it has passed through the process of this new reformation, might be described as a great society for the extension of University teaching, only it would be considerably more than that phrase at present implies. For not only would its clergy be the authorized agents for conveying the best knowledge of the times in literature, science, and art, into all parts of the country; but they would similarly be commissioned to deal with ethical and spiritual questions—a field which is as yet untouched, as near as may be, by any such society at present existing.

I am, of course, aware that a thousand practical difficulties may be urged as proving the scheme I am advocating to be hopeless and visionary, how, ever admirable in its general idea. No doubt grave problems would arise—some of them hard to solve; but what great reform worthy the name has not been carried out in the face of great difficulties? Some of these problems have already been anticipated and considered in a little volume called "Church Reform," one of the "Imperial Parliament Series," published by Messrs. Sonnenschein; and I hope that such of you as are interested in

this question will read what is there contained—it is the work of several writers; for though I think some of the proposals are inadequate, I am in general sympathy with it, and I should be sorry for any of you to carry away the impression that what I am advocating is the mere creation of my brain. "An increasing number of thoughtful men and women have, for some years past, been looking in this direction for the best solution of the Church Establishment question. We are all agreed that things cannot remain as they are; but it is not in liberation from State control, so much as in making that control a reality, that we think the true answer will be found. State control, as it exists, leaves the clergy independent of the people whom they serve; and so it has, during the last forty years, done more than anything else to foster the growth of what I must call sacerdotal arrogance—for the thing exists, though I do not like using what sounds like abusive language; but State control in the sense of popular control would soon change all that. The Church of England does not need a liberation which would really give freer play only to ecclesiastical despotism; it is the people who need liberation from that. But it does need freeing from dogmatic fetters forged in an age when modern ideas of toleration were yet unknown. And from personal knowledge I can affirm that, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, there are hundreds and thousands of Churchmen who would be glad to have these fetters lightened, though I admit they are not yet prepared to abandon them altogether.

Presumably, on the repeal of the Act of Uniformity, while prosecutions on account of unorthodoxy would become impossible, I take it that the various congregations, or parishes, would elect councils whose business it would be to see to the conduct of the Church services, in such a manner as is best suited to the peculiar circumstances of each place; and this would hinder any sudden and violent breach with the past, while it would leave the door open for progressive modifications. The question of the appointment or removal of clergymen presents greater difficulties; and perhaps it would be best to have no uniform method everywhere. In regard to the removal of unsuitable men, doubtless the opinion of the congregation ought to have the greatest weight; but it should be understood that this applies to moral and intellectual disqualifications, and not to a mere disapproval of a man's more liberal views. For it must be borne in mind that a congregation is not infrequently less enlightened than its minister—indeed, the whole idea of the Church as an educational institution implies that this is the normal case—and it would be intolerable if a well-read and conscientious clergyman should be deprived of his post because he tells his people, for example, the truth about the Bible; while we must not forget the case, far commoner than is supposed, especially among Dissenting communities, where the minister preaches down to the level of his flock, and affects an orthodoxy to which his intelligence does not assent, for fear of offending his deacons or other church officials. And the same considerations apply to the question of clerical appointments. Leave

the appointments absolutely in the hands of the congregation, whose knowledge of the clerical world hardly extends beyond their own particular church, and you are in danger of encouraging that very narrowness which popular control ought to prevent. I confess that I am all against the direct election of a clergyman by the congregation; I think it bad for both sides. I should like to see the appointments in the hands of a body whose horizon is wider—say, a Committee of the local District or County Council, subject no doubt to a veto of the congregation affected with the grounds definitely stated in writing. But it is a difficult question, and I only throw out these ideas as suggestions. The fact, however, that the Church of England has on the whole been widened by the existence of a considerable amount of lay patronage, even when placed in irresponsible hands, is in favour of my contention that the spiritual freedom of the Church would be best served in the future by a continuance of this method of lay patronage exercised by representative bodies. Of course it is hardly necessary to add that any form of Disestablishment would put an end to this kind of lay patronage. All appointments to posts in our cathedrals and parish churches would be made by the bishops or the clergy or else by those little cliques of devout laymen who are often more clerical than the most reverend of the clergy themselves.

I have said perhaps enough to lay this subject before you for consideration; but now that I am concluding, I see how much more might be adduced to illustrate and enforce my argument. Take, for example, the contemptible condition of theological and Biblical criticism in England as compared with what we see in France, Germany, and even in Holland. Our endowments in aid of these studies are magnificent compared with those in the countries I have named; but the professorships can only be held, in virtue of Act of Parliament, by men in Priests' Orders who have solemnly sworn that they believe about the Bible and Prayer Book much the same that was believed by the divines of the seventeenth century; and if their studies should cause them to abandon this belief, they are bound in conscience (so it seems to me) to resign their posts. The result is that the Established Church has become a kind of endowed conspiracy to hush up all that more independent students in foreign countries have done to throw light on the dark places of theology.

Nor must we forget how this obscurantism of the Established Church affects the smaller voluntary Churches by its side. It sets the fashion, and they follow. The Unitarians themselves, in spite of their far more rational position, are hardly an exception to this rule in England, though in the United States they are less hampered by conservative traditions. But the Church of England's obscurantist influence extends even to America and the colonies, while a widening of its intellectual life at home would doubtless have a corresponding influence across the seas. In truth this National Establishment of Religion, which we have inherited from our fathers, is a great trust, not only in its power for good or evil at home, but in the

part that it is competent to play in the widening of the religious life of English-speaking people all over the world. I think that most of us do not sufficiently realize that, while this Church remains a State institution, we hold its future in our hands. We can, of course, in impatience at its obvious faults, refuse to recognise our responsibility to lapse into the hands of others who will know the worth of what we are giving away. But I would ask you to remember the value of all existing organizations; to remember that the worst use we can make of an institution is to destroy it. It is a fine saying of Burke's: "Wisdom cannot create materials; her pride is in their use." Before many years are gone the people of England will be called upon seriously to consider whether they are able and willing to use, in the light of modern science and criticism, the materials for religious, spiritual, and ethical culture, which the piety of past centuries has created for them; or whether they prefer to let their inheritance pass into sectarian hands. If our consideration of this subject this afternoon has done anything to better the prospects of the former alternative, I do not think that you will complain that I have wasted your time.

INDEX.

- Abidharma Pitaka*: 158.
 Act of Uniformity: Repeal 817.
Adi Granth: 306, 310.
 Aims-giving, Muhammadan: 295.
 Amenotbes IV.: King 7, 8.
 American Presbyterian Church: 550; Native Religion 354-375.
 Americans, Ancient: Probable Descent 355, 356.
 Ancestor Worship: 56, 58, 59, 71, 73, 99, 110;
 Greek 220-224; Hindu 119; Teutonic 279.
 Antony: Caves of 427.
 Anu: 29, 30.
 Apocryphus: among Slavs 403.
 Apostasy: 670, 671.
 Apostles' Creed: 469.
 Apostles: Irvingite 595, 596.
 Apponages: Russian System 425.
 Arabat, The: Life 148, 149.
 "Arabatship": Thirty-seven Divisions of 147-149.
 Ark, The: 56.
 Armenia: Exposed Position 380; History 382;
 Primitive Inhabitants 380; Religious Position
 382; Sun Worship 385.
 Armenian: Conversion to Christianity 384, 385;
 Church 379-404; Convent at Venice 395, 397;
 Ritual 388, 393; Government 394; Liturgy
 393; Sacraments 393, 394; Wide Dispersion
 379.
 Armenian Baptist: 572.
 Arya Samaj, The: 124.
 Art, True: 633, 634.
 Assemblies: Sikh 310.
 Asshur: 28, 29.
 Assyria: Religion 26-47.
 Athanasius, St.: Creed 555.
 Atonement, The: 661, 662.
 Attributes, Six, of Zoroaster: 182.
 Authority: Divine 668.
 Avalokitesvara: Worship of 178, 179.
 Avesta, The: 180; Age 197; Ritual 196; Study
 of 192.
 Aztec Civilization: 358, 359.
 Babel, The: Persecution of 347-350.
 Babilism: 334-353; Centre of, removed to Baghdad
 350; Doctrines 351, 352, 353; Later History
 351-353.
 Babylon: Establishment of 21; Fall 23; Religion
 15-25.
 Baptism: Rite 500, 510, 562, 563, 564, 565, 568.
 " for the Dead: 565-567.
 Baptist Church, English: Origin 564, 566, 567;
 Missions, 567.
 Baptists: General, Founding of 571; Intellectual
 Freedom due to 568; Place of, in Evolution of
 Christianity, 559-574; Religious Organization
 of, 567; True Place 561, 562, 572.
 Basil, Duke: 427, 429.
Baskets of the Law: 157, 158.
 Beating the Bounds: Custom 246-248.
 Bel: 29, 30.
 Betrothal, Infant, among Parsis: 189.
Bible, The, as an authority: 445, 446, 454.
 Biblical Criticism, State of, in England 812.
Book of Mormon: 671-675.
Book of the Dead: 1.
Book of Plain Words: 87, 88.
Book of Reconspices: 88, 90.
Books of Chronicles: 50, 51.
Books of Samuel: 46, 47.
 Brahma: 115.
 Brahman, The: 124.
 Brahmaric Scriptures: 124.
 Brahmo Samaj: 124.
 Buddha: Life 169; Parting Charge to Disciples
 165; Mission 165; Sayings 159, 160; Sermon
 173; Spiritual Control 162, 173; Teachings
 164.
 Buddha and Buddhism: 152-165.
 " and Christ: 154-158; Estimates of Peniten-
 tial Exercises 137.
 " and Plato: 175.
 " and Zoroaster: 169, 170.
 Buddhism: 76, 126, 129-151; Characteristics 152;
 Doctrines 155, 156, 158, 161; Secret of Power
 of 173, 174, 175; Doctrine of Impermanence
 129, 143, 156; Doctrine of Reward and Pun-
 ishment 155; Roots 155; Teaching 169, 170,
 171, 174; Theory of Individually 144.
 Buddhism in China: Introduction into 173; Source
 of Influence 175.
 Buddhism in Japan: Development 94; Disestab-
 lishment 104; Founding 93; Teachings 95;
 Supremacy 103.
 Buddhist Temples of Shinto Shrines: 96.
Bulls amongst Penitents: 137.
 Bunting, Dr.: 585.
 Burial of the Dead: Slavonic 274.
 Calvin, John: 536-539, 542, 543.
 Cardole, J. Bote: 594, 595, 596, 597.
 Castes: Hindu 124.
 Catechism: Parsi 186.
 Catholic Apostolic Church: 594-601.
 " Roman, Church: 442-461; Effort to Sub-
 jugate Japan 95, 96; English Attitude towards
 278; Meaning of 448-451; Missions 446;
 Teachings 447, 460; Universality 444; Vitality
 442-444, 466.
 Catholic, Old: *see* Old Catholics.
 Caves: Mithraic 203, 204.
 Chaldean: Legend of Creation 38, 39; Mythology
 16, 17, 18.
 Cholmers, Thomas: 547, 548.
 Champollion: 3.
 Chung, Pope: 90, 91.
 Chouvin, Gerard: 535, 536.
 " John: 536-539, 542, 543.
 Cherubim, The: 54.
 China: Religion 68-75.
 Chinese Pilgrim, Fable of a: 178.
 Christ: Divinity 452, 453; Mission 445.
 " and Mithra 210.
 Christendom, Theology of: Influence of Greece
 on 245.
 Christianity: Early, an Intellectual Movement 555;
 Expansiveness 711, 712; Harm wrought by
 373, 374; Introduction into Russia 420.
 Christianity: and Eastern Beliefs Contrasted 94, 95.
 " and Muhammadanism: Common
 Ground 300.
 Christians, Armenian: Persecution of 386.
 Christmas Day: Mithraic Celebration 214.
Chronicles, *Books of the*: 50, 51.
 Choang-122: Sayings of 85, 86.
 Church and State: Doctrine 668, 669.
 " and Synagogue: Difference between their
 Teachings 693.
 Church of Armenian 370-404; Distinguishing Marks
 of Ritual 388, 393; Government 394; Liturgy
 393; Sacraments 393, 394.
 Church: Catholic: *see* Catholic.
 " of England: 508-519, 537; a Compromise
 508; Disestablishment 510, 517, 518, 519;
 Probable Results of Disest. 812-815; Endow-
 ment 518; Gain and Loss of Power 516; Op-

- ganization 513, 514; Reasons for Retain-
 ing 507, 509, 510; Reform Desirable, 510, 511; Its
 Task 508, 514; Wealth, 514, 515.
 Church: Greek: *see* Greek Church.
 " Irish Prot. Episc.: Disestab. 807, 808.
 " Lutheran: 532.
 " National, A.: 806-810; Principle of 508,
 509, 510, 511; Defects in System of a 511, 512.
 Church: Nestorian: *see* Arminian.
 " New: *see* Swedenborg.
 " of Latter-Day Saints: 657-682.
 " Presbyterian: *see* Presbyterianism.
 " Reformed, of France 543, 544; of Nether-
 lands 543.
 Church: Russian 418-441; Advancement of Learn-
 ing in 438; Dissent 428; Government 423;
 Independence 430; Ritual 429, 433; Revision
 of Ritual 436, 437.
 Churches, Nonconformist: *see* their names; Self-
 Government among 530.
 Civilization: Aztec 358, 359; Peruvian 371.
 Class Meetings: Methodist 591, 592.
 Clement of Rome: 473.
 Clergy, Beneficed: Intellectual Deterioration 515,
 516; Position 512, 513.
 Cologne: Congress at 501, 502; Election of Bishops
 at 502.
 Confucianism: 76.
 Confucius: 61-68; Ancestry 61, 62; as Minister
 of Crime 64; Death 65; Estimate of Himself
 64, 65; Eulogy on 68; Teaching 166.
 Congress: at Cologne 501, 502; at Munich 501.
 Conscience: Liberty of, in France 687.
 Constantine: Teachings of 525.
 Cosmogony: Buddhist 176, 177; Chaldean 38, 39;
 Dante's 480, 490; Teutonic 280, 281.
 "Council of Zion," The: 397.
 Crisp, Stephen: 578.
 Customs: Heathen, Survival in England 253, 254-
 and Superstitions: Slavonic 263.
 Cyprian, St.: as Metropolitan, 457, 472.
 Cyril, St.: 422, 471, 473; Catechism of 472; made
 Metropolitan of Kiev 436.
 Cyrus, the Deliverer: 23.
 Damayanti's Choice: 130, 131, 132-135.
 Daniel of Gallitz: 435, 436.
 Dante: Creed 492-493; *Divine Comedy* 495;
 Love 484, 485; Religious Influence 484; Teach-
 ing 495; Vision 486; and Beatrice; Relations
 between 486, 487; and Milton; Similarities be-
 tween 496.
 Dargen Paik-Ahi: 310.
 Delos: 227, 228.
 Dervish, The: 324.
 Deuteronomic Torah: 43.
 Deuteronomy: Differences from Original History
 44, 45.
Dhammapadam: 158, 159.
 Diabolical Agencies: Belief in 253.
 Disestablishment: *see* Church of England.
 Drummond, Henry: 594, 595, 596.
 Dualism: Introduction of 17.
 Duty: Japanese Ideals 97.
 Dwarfs: Slavonic 373.
 Eastern Beliefs and Christianity Contrasted: 94,
 95.
 Eästre, the Heathen Goddess: 252.
Adda, the Older: 278.
 " *the Younger*: 278.
 Edict of Nantes: 543, 544.
 Egil, the Poet: 289.
 Egypt, Ancient: Religion 3-9.
 Elohist, The: 42, 43.
 Elves: Slavonic Belief in 266.
 Elysium: 237.
 Emancipation, Catholic: 527.
 Emblems, Paris: 192.
 Endowment of the Church: *see* Church of Eng-
 land.
 England, Church of: *see* Church of England.
 English Presbyterian Church: 546.
 Erastian Theory: 400.
 Eridu, City of: 15.
 Ethical Movement: Defined 737-739; Antecedent.
 other Movements 720, 721; Demands upon
 its Supporters 703; Teachings 720-724.
 Eucharist: 454, 455, 456, 457, 461-481.
 Evil Principles: Abstract Qualities 171.
 Evolution: Doctrines 769; Characteristics of the
 Theory 769; Ethics 770-783, 784-786; Posi-
 tion of the Theory 783; Views of Future Life
 781; What it is 734.
 Evangelicals, The: 547.
 Fables, the Framework of Greek Theological
 Systems: 216.
 Faith: 662, 663.
 Family: Life of, merged into Life of State 223.
 Fane, Teutonic, in Heligoland: 283, 286.
 Fasting: Muhammadan in 295.
 Fate, Mystery of: Buddhist Doctrine 145, 146.
 Festivals: Greek 227; Icelandic 52, 60; Mexican
 266.
 Fire Worshipers: 192.
 Flambert: 730.
 Formules, Church: Revision of 508.
 Fox, George: 575-577, 571; Mission 577; Teach-
 ing 577-580.
 Free Will: 449, 450, 451.
 Free thought, English: 527.
 Future Life: Assyrian View 37, 38; Buddhistic
 145, 146; Chinese 73, 74; Evolutionist 781;
 Hindu 120, 121; Independent Church 556;
 Japanese 229; Slavonic 275; Teutonic 286,
 287.
 Galanus: Forged Documents from 395.
 Games, Hellenic: Political Influence 226, 227.
Gáthas: 180, 181.
German Theology: 721.
 Ghost, Holy: 667, 668.
 Giants: Slavonic 272, 273.
 Gifts: Spiritual 669, 670.
 Goddesses: Assyrian 33, 34; German 252.
 Godhead, The: 659, 660.
 Gods: Assyrian 28, 34, 35, 36; Egyptian 3-9, 10;
 Hindu 115, 118, 119; Hittite 10, 12; Shinto 110.
 Greek and Latin Religions: 216-245.
 " Church: 405-418; Doctrines 407-409, 410-
 416, 417, 418; Icons in 417; Priesthood 409;
 Sacraments 416; and Armenian 384.
 Groves, Sacred: German 249; Lithuanian 262.
 Hades: 239; Assyrian 38; Dante's 400, 401.
 Happiness, the great purpose of social life: 802.
 Hez: 29, 30, 31.
 Heligoland: Teutonic Fane at 285, 286.
 Hercules: 444.
 Heresy: the Paulician 324, 404, 524.
 Heretics: Persecution 402, 403; Abolition of
 Burning of 570.
 Hermes: 237, 239.
 Hermits: Taoist 83.
 Herzog, Professor: 503.
 Hestia: 237.
Hixateuch: 42, 43.
 Hinduism: Characteristics 112, 113, 114; Constant
 Changes in 123; Definition 112; Doctrine of
 Liberation 120, 121; of Future Punishment
 123, 124; Elasticity 122; Ethical Bearings
 123; Inner Meaning 113, 117, 118; Main-
 spring of 125; Sects 122; Spread 129; Tran-
 sition into Brahmanism 120.
Historia Danica of Saxo: 278.
 Historical Protestantism: 531-551.
 History, Philosophy of: Birth of 560.
 Hittite: Religion 10-14.
 Holy Ghost: 667, 668.
 Humanity: 730-751; Enthusiasm of 618, 619;
 Kingdom of 744, 745; Reality of 746-748;
 Religion of (meaning of) 740.
 Hoseyn ibn Mansur: Martyrdom 519.
 Hypercæ: 238.
 Icons, Use of, in Greek Church: 417.
 Ideal Faith: New Birth of 726; of
 of the 18th century 727.

- Ideal, The Taoist: 83, 84.
 Ideals of Duty: Japanese 97.
 Idols in Israel: 57.
 Imagination: Province of 803.
 Imamate: Doctrine of the 333, 334.
 Imāms, The: 334.
 Impermanence: Buddhist Doctrine 142, 143, 156.
 Incas: Origin of Name 356; Rule 373.
 Independency: 552-558; Characteristics 553, 554;
 Dagmas 555, 556, 557; Merits 556.
 India, Ancient: Position of Women in 132; Life
 in, in time of Buddha 162.
 Indian Poetry, Old: 126-141; Characteristics
 130; Demons in 129; Mysticism in 129, Sen-
 timental Temper 135; Source of Inspiration
 128.
 Inscrptions: Assyrian 51; Babylonian, 18; Chal-
 dean, 15; Cuneiform 381; Egyptian 52; Hittite
 11, 13; of Mesha 52.
 Institutes of Christian Religion: 539.
 Irish Presbyterian Church: 550; Prot. Episc.
 Church Diastabl.: 807, 808.
 Irving, Edward: 594, 595.
 Irvingism: 594-602; Apostles 595, 596; Character
 599; Doctrines 599; Ritual 598; System 596,
 600.
 Irvingites: Dispersion 597; Separation 595.
 Isé: Pilgrimages to 107.
 Ishtar's Descent into Hades: 39-41.
 Japan: People 93; Religions 92-98.
 Jehovah: Conception 53, 54; Dwelling Place 54,
 55; Limited Authority 52; Origin of Name
 11; Priests 57, 58.
 Jehovahist, The: 42.
 Jephthah: Story of 45.
 Jerusalem, Establishment of 21.
 Jewish Religion: 42-60; Ethics 695-708; God nat-
 merely Tribal 705; Sources 42.
 Jews: Importance of Creed to 697; Improved Educa-
 tion 684; Mission 692; Moral Teaching 698,
 699, 702; View of Almsgiving 699, 700; View
 of Christianity 692; In Austria 684, 685, 687;
 Britain 688, 691, 692; Germany 684; Spain
 685, 686.
 John the Terrible: Council Summoned by 429;
 Madness 422; Speech 429.
 Journalism, Paris: Extension of 187.
 Judaism: see Jewish Religion.
 Judges, Book of: 43; Appendices to 43, 46.
 Jupiter: 244.
 Kabir, the Refarmer: 304.
 Karri na Michi: 94, 99, 102.
 Kammurabi, King: 21.
 Kan Ying Pien: 88-90.
 Karaites, The: 685.
 Karma: 649; Doctrine 144, 145; Meaning 175.
 Kiev: Celebrations at 418.
 Kilhamites, The: 587.
 Kings of Israel: Condemnation of 48; Table of
 49, 50.
 Kings, Book of: Criticism of 47-50.
 Knax, John: 544-546.
 Krishna: 115, 116, 117, 303.
 Kur-nat'u'-Ayn: 340, 341, 349.
 Kwan-yin: Worship of 179, 179.
 Laou-tseu: Teaching of 166.
 Laræ: 245.
 Larvæ (spectres of dead): 245.
 Last Supper, The: 464.
 Latin and Greek Religions: 216-245.
 Latter-Day Saints: Church of 658; Articles of
 Faith 658, 659.
 Lay Work in Church of England: 515, 517.
 Legends: Armenian, conn. with Gregory 383, 384;
 Assyrian 38; Babylonian 38; connected with
 Buddha 153, 154, 158.
 Lemurs: 245.
 Liberty, Religious: Doctrine 569.
 Lieh-tsi: Stories of 86, 87.
 Literature: Armenian 386, 387; Buddhist, Diffu-
 sion of 173, 174; Prophetic 50.
 Livings: Traffic in 517, 518.
 Local Church Government [Independency]: 552-
 558.
 Lotus: as Emblem of Creation 176; School's Influ-
 ence of 176.
 Love Feasts: Methodist 591, 592.
 True: 626, 627, 635.
 Luther and Lutheran Church: 531, 532.
 Mahādhārāt: 126, 127, 130; Antiquity 127; Re-
 ligious Sentiment 126; Stories from 130, 131,
 132-135.
 Mahā Kavya Charita: 173.
 Man, Universal Brotherhood of: 650-659.
 Manes: 245.
 Manetha: 3.
 Māra [Evil Principle]: 170.
 Marriage: Muhammadan 296-298.
 Mass, The: 454, 455, 456, 457, 462-482; Basis,
 Tenour, and Hist. 462-473; Dominant Idea
 482; Liturgical Form 477, 468, 469; Phil-
 osophy 473; Sacrifice at 470.
 Mecca: Pilgrimage to 295.
 Melville, Andrew: 546.
 Men, Judged by their Works: 660, 661.
 Mendelssohn, Moses: 683-684.
 Methodism: 585-593; Characteristics 585, 586;
 Class Meetings 591, 592; Doctrines 586, 587;
 588, 589; Increased Liberty of 588; not a
 Church 591; Personal Consecration 588;
 Women Preachers 587.
 Methodius: 422.
 Mexico: Religion of 359, 360.
 Millennium: 594.
 Minerva: 244.
 Mirza 'Ali Muhammad: Life and Teachings 334-
 339, 343-346; Efforts to Spread his Faith 339-
 341; Fate of his Followers 341, 342, 343, 345,
 346, 347, 348, 349; Religious System 343, 344.
 Mithra, Bull of: 200, 201; Herodotus's Statement
 about 198; of Two Sexes 200; and Christ,
 Parallel between 210; Mithra a Pagan Christ
 198.
 Mithraic Caves: 203, 204; Celebration of Christ-
 mas Day 214; Ceremonies 205; Monuments in
 England 294, 295; Mysteries 205, 206, 207,
 208, 209, 212; Symbolism 200, 202, 207, 210,
 212, 213.
 Mithraism: 194-215; Assimilation of, by Christi-
 anity 209-211; History 196, 197; Nature of
 System 197; Universality 194, 195, 198.
 Monasteries: Establishment in Russia 424, 427,
 429.
 Morality: Basis of 82; Utilitarian 80, 801, 802.
 Marmonism: History 677-680; Message 681, 682.
 Mormon, Book of: 673-675.
 Mormons, The: 657-682; Origin of Name 657
 Outcry against 657.
 "Most Holy Governing Synod": 439.
 Mount Ararat: Legend of 380.
 Muhiyyu'd-Din Ibnu 'l-'Arabi: 320.
 Muhammad: Character 298, 299; Religious Posi-
 tion of 293.
 Muhammadanism: 294-300; Fasts 295; Preachers'
 Social Equality 296; Teaching 292; and Chris-
 tianity 293, 300; and Judaism 295.
 Mullā Huseyn: 339.
 Mysteries: Christian 210, 212, 213; Hellenic 242;
 Their Influence on Christian Church 242, 243;
 Mithraic 205, 207, 208, 209, 210.
 Mysticism: 632-639, 720.
 Myths: Assyrian 29, 30; Buddhist 153, 154; Chal-
 dean 18; Egyptian 5; Hellenic 229, 230, 231;
 Mexican 360; Satanic 257; Teutonic 280.
 Mythology: Absence of, in Early Greek Religion
 225; Chaldean 16, 17, 28; Slavonic 260.
 Nabonidus, King of Babylon: 22.
 Names, Heathen: Survival in England 253.
 Nānak, Guru: Life 304, 307-309; Successors 309-
 311; Teachings 304, 305, 309.
 National Church, A.: 806-819.
 Nature: External Power of 633.
 Nazirites: 57, 58.

- Nestorian Church: *see* Armenian.
 New Church, The (Swedenborgian) 652, 656.
 Doctrinal Aspect 655, 656; Philosophical Aspect 652-654; Practical Aspect 656; Spiritual Aspect 654.
 Nicen, the Patriarch: 434-437.
 Nirvana: 145, 146, 155, 163, 177.
 "Noble Eightfold Path": 161, 162.
 "Noble Path": Eight Stages of 146, 147.
 Nonconformity, English: 520-530; Benefits we owe to it 527, 528, 509; Chief Value 530; Limits 530, 531; Original Source 522, 523.
 Nymphs, Water: Slavonic 269-272.
 Oannes: Legend of 16, 17.
 Oedipus: Story of 216.
 Old Catholicism: 493-507; Doctrines 503, 506.
 " " and Church of England: Sym-
 " pathy between 503, 504.
 Old Catholics: Sufferings of 505; Power of Clergy 506.
 Old Testament: Tenderness tow Animals 703, 704.
Older Edda, The: 273.
 Ordination: Effect of 815.
 Ostara, Heathen Goddess: 252.
 Othuel: 44, 45.
 Paganism: Influence on Christianity 246-259.
 Panjāb, The, a Muhammadan State: 312, 303.
 Pantheism: 121, 125; Mainspring of Hinduism 125.
 Pantheon: Assyrian 27; Babylonian 27.
 Paracelsus: 621.
 Paradise, Western: Buddhist belief in 177, 178.
 Parsism: 184-193; Doctrines 189-191; Education of Children 187; Emblems 192; Emigration to India 184; Intellectual Progress 185; Position of Women 188.
 Patriarchy, The Armenian: 332.
 Paul, St.: Teachings of 523, 524.
 Penn, William 579.
 Penitential Exercises: Buddha's Estimate 137.
 Perikles: 261, 262.
 Pert: Civilization 371; Decay of Native Religion 363; Kings or Ines of 368; Pantheon 368; Present State 371; Sultee 370.
 Peter the Great: 438.
 Peters, Hugh: 571, 572.
 Pillars, Holy: 56.
 Pisans (Evil Principle): 170.
 Pitakas: Buddhist 157.
 Planes, the Seven Cosmic: 643-647.
 Planetary Gods of Assyria, 36.
 Plato and Buddha: Agreement between 175.
 Poles, Holy: 56.
 Polydemonism: 4.
 Pope, Infallibility 499, 500; Protest against 500.
 Positivism, 740; Creed 745; Philosophy 743-745; Scheme 739.
 Prayer: 478; Efficacy (Secularist View) 796-798; Intercessory 476, 477; Shiite Form 705.
 Preachers: Muhammadan 194.
 Presbyterianism: Distinctive Points 539-541; Historical 532-535; History 532-535; Mission 555.
 Priesthood: American 550; English 548; Irish 550.
 " Mexican 562, 564, 565, 566.
 " Russian Schools for Training 423, 424.
 " Teutonic 234.
 Principle, Evil: Abstract Qualities 171.
 Prometheas: 232-235, 231.
 Protestantism: Early Days 565.
 Punishment and Reward: Buddhist Doctrine 175, 176; Chinese 74.
 Puritanism: 595.
 Quakerism: Doctrines 577, 579, 580, 581, 582; Characteristics 583; Reformation 575-584.
 Quetzalcoatl: Myth of 563.
 Rā: 28.
 Race, Human: Eternity 748, Solidarity 144, 145.
 Radgost: 262.
Rahamatul Mawdihah: 187, 188.
 Rajah Wovamitra: Story of 137-140; Yayati: story of 140, 141.
Ramāyan: 126, 127, 130; Antiquity 127; Religious Sentiment in 126.
 Rameses II.: Treaty with 10, 11.
 Rana: 155, 156.
 Reason: Function of 802.
 Reformation, English: 443, 445.
 Re-incarnation: Meaning of 617-649.
 Reinkens, Bishop: 502.
 Relics: Wor-ship of, in China 171.
 Religion: Definition 258, 276; Final Aim 295; Highest Form of Education 277; Meaning of 477, 741; Truth in all Religions 476, 477.
 " of Dante: 443-477.
 " " Nature (Rousseau): 724-738.
 " " the Future: 806.
 Renaissance, The: 463.
 Repentance: 663, 664.
 Revelation: 691, 777.
 " Christ: Catholic View of 417.
 Reward and Punishment: Buddhist Doctrine 175, 176; Chinese 74; Teutonic 287.
 Righteousness: Motives to 801.
 Rites, Religious: Generally 121; Value of 605.
 American 385, 386; Assyrian 37; Chaldean 25; Chinese 61, 71, 74, 76, 77; Jewish 59; Mexican 360, 362, 363, 367; Mittra: 215; Muhammadan 234; Persian 360-371; Sumatran 24, 24, 105; Slavonic 231; Teutonic 234; Toltec 367.
 Role, deamless: of Christ 221, 212; of Osiris 211, 212.
 Roman Catholic: *see* Catholic.
 Romanoff: Accession of House of 431.
 Rousseau, J. J.: On Education 737. *Discours* 731-733, *Emile* 131; Philosophy 735; Place in Spiritual Revol of 18 Cent. 718, 729; Politics 737; Source of his Power 729; Teachings 733-737, 738.
Ruhnamah: 192.
 Russia: Attacked by Sweden 425. Napoleonic Invasion 439; Tartar Invasion 425.
 Russian Church: *see* Church, Russian.
 Ryūbu-Shinto: 99, 102, 103.
 Sacramental Presence: 428.
 Sacraments: Catholic 451-455, 456, 457; Methodist 536.
 Sacred Animals: 4.
 Sacrifice at Catholic Mass: 470.
 " to Jehovah 59.
 Salvationism: 390.
 Samson: 44, 46.
Samsat, Hooks of: 46, 47.
 Sankarā harya, the Reformer: 302, 303.
 Sankhya: Philosophy 115.
 Sarmatov: 225.
 Sava Ormianicus: 278.
 Schems: 238.
 Schools: Chaldean 13, 19, Part Establishment of Girls' Schools 184; Russian 431, 434.
 Scotland: Disestablishment in 708.
 Scriptures: Brahmanic 114, Buddhist 157.
 Seasons: Personification of 267.
 Secularism: 794-805; Definition 795, 796; Negative Side 804; Philosophy of 804; Practical Work 804, 805; Views on Morals 799; on Immortality 798, 799.
 Separatism: 565, 566, 171.
 Seraphim, The: 54.
 Sergius, St., Russian Hermit: 479.
 Shamas, the Sun god: 72.
 Shinto: 94; Gods 112; Origin of Name 99; Shrines and Buddhist Temples 104, 105, 106, 109; Tenets 109, 110; True Elements 102.
 Shintoism: 99-111; Emblems 104, 106; History 109, 103; System of 102.
 Sikhism: 701-713; Antiquity 701; Assemblies 710; Attempt to Revive 713; Effect of in India 704; History 707, 711; Institution 711, 712; Ordinances 712; Philosophical Basis 704-707, 712.
 Sin: Idea of, in Israel 60.
 " the God 30.
 Shippa, City of: 20.